In Memoriam

THE REVEREND ARTHUR ROMEYN GRAY, D.D.

Born Bergen Point, New Jersey, December 30, 1875.

Son of George Zabriskie and Kate Forrest Gray.

Died in New York City, January 11, 1933.

Educated at Groton Academy, Columbia University, and Oxford.

Ordained Deacon, 1900, and Priest, 1901, in the Protestant Episcopal Church.

Professor of Apologetics, 1901-11, the University of the South, Sewanee, and Chaplain, 1908-11.

Developed The University Press, and later presented it to the University.

Educational Secretary and Latin-American Secretary of Board of Missions of the Church, 1911-30.

Member of staff of Cathedral of St. John the Divine, New York, 1930-33.

He edited and published the SEWANEE THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY, as follows:

The Doctrine of the Church—By Rt. Rev. Dr. A. C. A. Hall

The Book of Common Prayer—by Rev. Dr. Samuel Hart

Christian Apologetics—By Rev. Dr. Arthur R. Gray

Manual of Early Ecclesiastical History—by Rev. Dr. Charles L. Wells

Church History, Medieval and Modern—by Rev. Dr. William Lloyd Bevan

The Old Testament—by Rev. Dr. Loring W. Batten

The remaining volumes of this series are being distributed by the University of the South through the generosity of Dr. Gray's family.

August 1, 1953.

Class 270 R Book B467 C.3

General Theological Seminary Library

CHELSEA SQUARE, NEW YORK

PRESENTED BY

University of the South

CHURCH HISTORY

MEDIÆVAL AND MODERN

SEWANEE THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY

GENERAL EDITOR—The Rev. ARTHUR R. GRAY, Educational Secretary of The Board of Missions; sometime Chaplain of the University of the South.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH, by the Rt. Rev. A. C. A. HALL, D.D., LL.D., Bishop of Vermont.

"It is at once most comprehensive and most condensed; and its dealing with some of the difficult and important questions of our time, such as the Resurrection, the Incarnation, and especially the Atonement, is a remarkable piece of clear theological statement and logical argument."—Rt. Rev. W. C. DOANE.

THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER (Second Edition, Revised), by the Very Rev. SAMUEL HART, D.D., LL.D., Dean of Berkeley Divinity School.

"It is admirably adapted to the uses of students of theology, and is, beyond comparison, the best book of its kind for the reading of Churchmen in general."—Dr GEORGE HODGES, *Dean of the Episcopal Theological School.*

APOLOGETICS, by the General Editor.

"Distinctly pragmatic, but also thoroughly theistic."—Dr. W. P. DUBOSE.

"This volume has many excellencies; but the chief of them is its masterly exposure of the claims of Naturalism."—*Princeton Theological Review.*

MANUAL OF EARLY ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY TO 476 A.D., by the Very Rev. CHAS. L. WELLS, Ph.D., Lecturer in History, McGill University, Montreal; sometime Dean of Christ Church Cathedral, New Orleans.

"Compact, clear, and admirably arranged. . . . A boon alike to men preparing themselves for examination and to the general reader."—*The Church Times* (London).

"Adapted for lay use; . . . . the layman . . . will find this a book . . . fit to set him on the way towards the mastery of Church History."—*The Expository Times.*

CHURCH HISTORY; MEDIÆVAL AND MODERN, by the Rev. WILSON LLOYD BEVAN, Ph.D., Professor of History and Economics, University of the South.

THE OLD TESTAMENT, by the Rev. LORING W. BATTEN, Ph.D., S.T.D., Professor of the Literature and Interpretation of the Old Testament, General Theological Seminary. (In preparation.)

THE NEW TESTAMENT, by the Rev. WILLIAM H. P. HATCH, B.D., Ph.D., Adjunct Professor of the Literature and Interpretation of the New Testament, The General Theological Seminary. (In preparation.)

ECCLESIASTICAL POLITY, by the Rev. GEORGE WILLIAM DOUGLAS, D.D., Canon of the Cathedral of St. John the Divine, New York. (In preparation.)

CHRISTIAN ETHICS. (To be arranged for.)

*** *In uniform volumes, 12-mo. cloth, printed on imported English paper, price $1.50 per volume, post prepaid.*

THE UNIVERSITY PRESS OF SEWANEE TENNESSEE

SEWANEE THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY

CHURCH HISTORY

MEDIÆVAL AND MODERN

BY

WILSON LLOYD BEVAN,

LATE GRADUATE SCHOLAR OF THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY;
DOCTOR OF POLITICAL SCIENCE, MUNICH;
PROFESSOR OF HISTORY, UNIVERSITY OF THE SOUTH.

The University Press
AT THE UNIVERSITY OF THE SOUTH
SEWANEE, TENNESSEE

270
B467
c3
124508

Copyright, 1914
By The University Press of
Sewanee Tennessee

EDITOR'S PREFACE

THE object of this series is to provide for the clergy and laity of the Church a statement, in convenient form, of its Doctrine, Discipline and Worship—as well as to meet the often expressed desire on the part of Examining Chaplains for text-books which they could recommend to candidates for Holy Orders.

To satisfy, on the one hand, the demand of general readers among the clergy and laity, the books have been provided with numerous references to larger works, making them introductory in their nature; and on the other hand, to make them valuable for use in canonical examinations, they have been arranged according to the canons of the Church which deal with that matter.

It is the earnest hope of the collaborators in this series that the impartial scholarship and unbiased attitude adopted throughout will commend themselves to Churchmen of all types, and that the books will therefore be accorded a general reception and adopted as far as possible as a *norm* for canonical examinations. The need of such a norm is well known to all.

And finally a word to Examining Chaplains. They will find that the volumes are so arranged that it will

be possible to adapt them to all kinds of students. The actual text itself should be taken as the *minimum* of requirement from the candidate, and then, by reference on their part to the bibliographies at the end of each chapter, they can increase as they see fit the amount of learning to be demanded in each case. It has been the endeavor of the editor to make these bibliographies so comprehensive that Examining Chaplains will always find suitable parallel readings.

If in any way the general public will be by this series encouraged to study the position of the Church, and if the canonical examinations in the different dioceses can be brought into greater harmony one with another, our object will be accomplished.

ARTHUR R. GRAY.

PREFACE

AN historical handbook constructed on rigid lines of abridgment can only be useful in so far as it suggests topics for futher study. It is impossible to acquire a great deal of learning from a handbook, but even a handbook in which events must be presented in a very limited space can be suggestive if it avoids the dead level of merely collocated facts. Critics are rightly skeptical as to the possibilities of making any condensed historical narrative interesting. History only becomes alive when one feels the impact of personality, and this result cannot be achieved unless details great and small are given. An historical narrative without details has as little stimulus as the résumé of a novel. In the teaching of history this must be brought home to the student before the real value of historical training can be communicated.

A handbook can, however, be a guide to reading and to study and it may also offer a method of giving coherence to the results of wider reading and study. One of the best examples of a condensed historical narrative covering a long period of time is to be found in the introduction by Samuel Rawson Gardiner to a bibliography of English history prepared by Professor J. B. Mullinger. Professor Gardiner was one

of the most characteristic examples of the modern historical scholar, who consciously restricts himself to the minute investigation of a limited period. Yet in this introduction of a few hundred pages he showed no timidtiy in interpreting the broad outstanding tendencies, changes and events in English history from the Saxon to the modern period. The fact that such work has been done and done well may be used as an encouragement to those of commonplace calibre who desire, as far as in them lies, to make the experience of the past accessible in a convenient and non-technical form to the men and women of the present day.

No one can pretend to be educated, even in a formal sense, except on the basis of an acquaintance with the records of civilized life as a whole. In the history of western Europe especially it is impossible to isolate church history from secular history. One of the illusions of modern sectarianism has made this seem not only possible, but desirable. Church history is a description of many of the most important date in the upward progress of man and society, and its lessons can only be concealed if they are imparted under a sectarian bias. The author of this handbook has attempted to avoid such a bias and if, in many cases, the desire to escape from partisan prejudice has produced an atmosphere of aloofness this must in no way be taken as indicating that the work is written

without definite presuppositions or even some cherished prejudices.

In the preparation of the bibliography advantage has been taken of the fact of the current publication of the *Cambridge Mediæval History*, which will give to the English reader an admirably arranged list of works covering a large part of the matter dealt with in this handbook. In preparing his own bibliography the writer of this manual has felt, therefore, emancipated from the necessity of following conventional lines. Some of the best-known books of earlier date are omitted simply because they are well known. Others, equally well known, are inserted because they are strong personal favorites. In certain cases originals have been inserted with the hope that the student may be induced to read interesting examples of historic writings of other periods. Many of the titles in the bibliography are found there because it was desired to place before the reader some of the most important books in the field of church history produced within the last four or five years. Here again the selective process has been largely personal. Subjects are introduced which appear to offer productive lines of research.

In the preparation of the text itself special indebtedness is owed to Karl Müller, E. Troeltsch, F. X. Funk and Henry Gee. It is to be regretted that the sections in chapters six and seven on the Roman Cath-

olic Church were prepared without the assistance of the second edition of the volume on Church history in *Der Kultur der Gegenwart*, in which there is an admirable sketch of the modern Roman Catholic Church by Professor Ehrhard of Strassburg. It will be noticed in the bibliography that there is no attempt made to include the subject of Spanish ecclesiastical history. A special bibliography in this department would be eminently useful. Those who work in Spanish history know the difficulty of following up local publications, many of which are hard to trace outside the Spanish peninsula. Those who have a mind to interest themselves in Spanish religious history can do no better by way of introduction than to dip into the pages of Florez' "España Sagrada" and the classical work of Mariana. They are certain to be amply rewarded for their pains.

W. L. B.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
	INTRODUCTION	1
I.	THE CHURCH AFTER THE TEUTONIC INVASIONS:	
	The Eastern Churches	5
	Celtic Christianity and Other Western Churches	8
	Gregory the Great	10
	The Church in England	14
	The Church and the New Society	20
	The New Penitential System	25
	The Church and Education	28
	The Advance of Islam	30
II.	THE CHURCH IN THE CAROLINGIAN EMPIRE:	
	The Genesis of Papal Independence	36
	St. Boniface	39
	The Papacy and the Franks	42
	Charles the Great and the Church	45
	The Papacy and the Later Carolingians	49
	Nicholas I	50
	Conflict with the Eastern Church	53
	The Church and Feudalism	56
	Alfred the Great	58
	Doctrinal Questions	59
III.	THE CLUNIAC REFORM AND THE HILDBRANDINE-SETTLEMENT:	
	The Genesis of the Cluniac Reform	62
	The Growth of the Reform Movement	64
	The Campaign Against Simony and Clerical Marriage	66
	The Champions of Reform at Rome	68
	The Normans and the Papacy	72
	Cluniac Aims and Ideals	75
	Hildebrand as Pope	79

The New Papal Machinery at Work 81
The Concordat of Worms 84
Missionary Expansion 88
Growth of the Oriental Church 90
The First Crusade 92
Doctrinal Development 94
St. Bernard and Monasticism 96
Beginnings of Scholasticism 99
The Cluniac Reform and Popular Religion 103
Heretical Sects 105
Canon Law and Curial Administration 108

IV. The Hildebrandine Papacy at Work:
Arnold of Brescia 113
The Papacy and Nationalism 115
The Church in England 117
Church Expansion 121
The Later Crusades 122
Innocent III 125
The Eastern Churches 130
The Separatist Movements 132
The Curial System 137
The Franciscans and Dominicans 139
Indulgences and Confession 143
The Universities 146
The Mystics 149
Frederick II 151
The Inquisition 153
The Eastern Question 155
Anti-Papal Movements 157

V. The Decline of the Hildebrandine Papacy:
The Papacy and the French Monarchy 162
The Hildebrandine System Attacked 166
Papal Finance 167
The Schism 170
The Conciliar Movement 173
Wyclif 174
Huss 177
The Council of Basel 178

The Renaissance Papacy 180
The Trend Toward Reform 181
Savonarola and Other Reformers Within the Church 183
Witchcraft 185
Later Scholasticism 186
Humanism 188
The Christian East 190
The Hussites and Other Sects 192
Julius II and Leo X 194

VI. The Period of Separation and Reform:
Erasmus 197
Luther 199
Zwingli 216
Calvin 219
The Anglican Reformation 226
Scotland and Ireland 247
France 250
Scandinavia 252
The Counter-Reformation 253
The Anabaptists 259

VII. Divided Christendom in Modern Times:
The Anglican Church 264
The Roman Catholic Church 278
Calvinism 289
Lutheranism 292
Missionary Expansion 295
American Christianity 299
The Eastern Church 310

Bibliography 320

Index 335

CHURCH HISTORY

MEDIÆVAL AND MODERN

INTRODUCTION

FROM the earliest period, Greek influence predominated within the Church; its authoritative writings are in Greek, and it secured most of its converts in Greek-speaking communities. When the Latin element began to emerge, it appeared first of all in the form of literary expression and intellectual method both closely related to Greek models. What is called the Hellenization of the Church may be said to have been practically completed with the age of the great patristic writers. Roughly speaking, the Latinization of the Church begins after the age of the Fathers. As it stands especially for the introduction of Roman principles of law and government, Latinization must be regarded as a complement to Hellenization, and not as a super-session of the varied cultural elements absorbed by the Church from the Greek world. The papacy grew to be an institution which represented the climax of Latin influence. All the various tendencies leading to a primacy resting on secular analogies and influenced by reverence for apostolic foundation are clearly outlined by Professor C. H. Turner in his chapter on "The Organization of the

Church", in the Cambridge Mediæval History (Vol. I), but these could not have culminated in the actualized papacy unless the Church had taken over from the Empire the ideals of Roman law, administration, and government. The development was furthered by the destruction of the Empire in its western provinces. Rome itself, in its ecclesiastical position, came to supply a place which the Roman civil government had lost when its provinces fell into the hands of the Germanic invaders, who ruled over them as masters, but made no attempt, except in Britain, to destroy the provincial populations, trained to revere the power of Rome.

The pontificate of Siricius (384-399) is especially important in the constitutional history of the papacy. He worked strenuously for the recognition of claims of oversight asserted by the Roman See, and exercised the right of judicial appeal throughout the Western Church. In the Church of North Africa not much success was achieved. Siricius' plan was so directed as not to cause opposition from strongly organized local churches, but rather to bringing the weaker churches of Gaul and Spain directly under Roman supervision. In the same spirit, Milan's sphere of influence was exempt from interference, but after that city ceased to be the residence of the imperial court, it was not difficult for the bishops of Rome to limit the ecclesiastical sway of Milan to the southern side of the Alps, and to encourage the independence in Italy, of Aquileia, and Ravenna, the new imperial

capital. Zosimus (417-418) established Arles in southern Gaul as the seat of a Roman vicariate, by which the bishop of this see as representing Rome was given primatial rights over the whole Gallic Church, and at the same time the Roman See took over the rule of supreme arbiter in all important canonical questions. Although the structure did not last long, owing to political changes, the method adopted by the papacy, of making the Western Churches its dependants, was most significant of the future development.

The position claimed for himself by Leo I (440-461) implied guardianship and oversight, not supersession, of the ordinary constitutional machinery of the Church. He strove to be an inspector-general rather than a dictator of the type realized in the mediæval papacy. His interest lay in the maintenance of existing canonical rule of, and so far as the Western Church was concerned, his activity in coördinating dioceses and provinces under the direction of the Roman See as the court of supreme appeal, was accepted as a natural and regular outcome of the Roman primacy. Only Milan remained free. The connection with Rome was the more valued because when the Roman provincial system was shattered in the western parts of the Empire, protection against the Germanic invaders who were, when not pagans, Arian Christians, could best be secured by association with Rome.

In 513, under Symmachus, began the custom of con-

ferring the pallium, a decorative neck vesture, used previously in the West only by the Roman bishop, which was now bestowed by him, as a symbol of dependence, on those prelates who had distinguished themselves as defenders or upholders of the programme inaugurated from Rome. In the East the situation was different: the exercise there of special privileges by Rome was never anything more than temporary. Felix, purposing to discipline the patriarch Accacius for claiming to exercise the primatial rights accorded to Constantinople by the Council of Chalcedon, summoned him to Rome. Of course the summons was refused (484), and for the next thirty-five years communion was broken off between the two sees. The Oriental Church was controlled by the emperor through his nominee, the patriarch, as administrator; in the West, the apex of the church system was the Roman bishop. But the full status of independence was not yet attained, for Theodoric the Ostrogoth did not hesitate to depose John I and nominate his successor (491), when it was found that the pope was intriguing for the restoration of imperial rule in Italy.

CHAPTER I.

THE CHURCH AFTER THE TEUTONIC INVASIONS

The Eastern Churches

THE first half of the sixth century in the East was marked by disputes arising over the Chalcedonian decrees. Theological dissensions were combined frequently with political and racial differences, for religious protests were often found the most effective method of attacking Byzantine autocracy. When Justinian (527-565) came to the throne he set out to re-conquer the lost western provinces. To accomplish this task coöperation with Rome and the Western Church was necessary, and their help could only be secured by repressing Monophysite influences in the East. As a basis of concord, the formula —"One of the Holy Trinity has suffered in the flesh"— was proposed. Justinian proceeded to enforce its acceptance. A further move to stop agitation and support the party of compromise may be seen in the formal condemnation of Origen as a teacher (543), and in the judgment passed on the three leading representatives of the Antiochan School, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Theodoret, and Ibas. This sentence, which decided the so-called Three Chapters Controversy, was most vigorously resisted in the newly restored western provinces,—Africa and Italy.

Vigilius, who had previously secured the promise of the succession to the Roman See from the Empress Theodora on condition that he would help the Monophysite party by reversing the decrees of Chalcedon, was now pope (545). Silverius had been deposed and Vigilius found himself obliged to fulfil his part of an unsavory contract. He first conformed to the imperial decision regarding the Three Chapters, but afterwards withdrew his approval when the Fifth General Council at Constantinople (553) adopted the condemnation of the Three Chapters. His successor, Pelagius (555), proved a more reliable instrument of imperial policy, and he carried with him the local Roman province in his anti-Chalcedonian attitude. But northern Italy, Illyria and Africa refused to follow, an act which led to a schism of considerable duration in the first two regions. In the East the Monophysites were far from satisfied with Justinian's concessions, and there arose in connection with this subtle thoelogical speculation national movements of protest within the bounds of the Empire that ended in the formation of permanent religious communions, all of which rejected the decrees of Chalcedon. In Egypt the separatist Monophysite organization was known as Coptic, in Syria it was called Jacobite, because of its founder Jacob Baradai, who in the last half of the sixth century showed remarkable organizing power in drawing together the eastern Monophysites into a compact body. One effect of the repression of Monophysitism was to send

its partisans out past the confines of the Empire, where they frequently became promoters of dissident organizations of a vigorous missionary type. To them is owed the foundation of the existing Church in Abyssinia. In Armenia, after some vacillation, the Church, owing to its jealousy of Greek influence, accepted the Monophysite position and parted from the Eastern Church in 651.

Justinian's own management of ecclesiastical affairs was thoroughly autocratic. His ideal was centralization, which meant the concentration under his control of all the machinery of church discipline and government. The canons became a part of the imperial law, and on the other hand the bishops were entrusted with civil functions that gave them oversight of the execution of laws affecting morals, treatment of the poor and unfortunate, and cases of maladministration. Bishops as well as all the members of the civil service were but parts of a great bureaucratic system of which the emperor was the head and actual director. Justinian's purpose to establish a doctrinal uniformity to harmonize with his regulated system of church government under state supervision was successful only outwardly. It is noteworthy that during this period a favorable reception was given to the work of an unknown mystical writer, who, using the name of Dionysius the Areopagite (Acts 17:34), contrived to give apostolic authority to a collection filled with neoplatonic conceptions, and plainly modelled after the teaching of Origen that had recently been officially

condemned. Circulating first among Monophysites, the writings of this pseudo-Dionysius, because of their claim to an early origin, came to have a potent influence on the development of ascetic religion throughout the Christian world.

Celtic Christianity and Other Western Churches

One of the most interesting and unexpected examples of church expansion in this period is found in the conversion of the distant regions of Britain and Ireland, where the isolation brought about by the Teutonic invasions introduced a church organization with peculiar racial characteristics. City and town life seemed to have disappeared when the Roman provincial system was destroyed; the Church soon became modelled in harmony with the tribal influences of Celtic society. From Britain, St. Patrick went forth before 432 to undertake the conversion of the Irish tribes. Earnest as his apostolate was, the full results of his labor were not visible until the middle of the sixteenth century. In Ireland in each small local tribal division the central organ of church life was the monastery, not the cathedral; administration was in the hands of the abbot, not the bishop. There were no parochial boundaries, and the ordinary diocesan regulations were not imposed upon the members of a monastery. Their cure of souls was general and not localized; and as parochial work was subordinated to ascetic

ideals, many cast aside all local attachments and spent their lives in distant lands as pilgrims or hermits, and carried with them the individualistic tendencies of their native land to France, Italy, and even to Egypt and Syria. One great achievement of the Irish Church was the extension of Christianity through St. Columba among the savage Picts; here the centre on which all mission posts depended was the Island of Iona, whose head, the presbyter abbot, controlled the Church in northeast Ireland, and west Scotland. The peculiarities of the Irish Church preserved the more elastic provincial autonomy that existed everywhere before the beginning of the fifth century. In relation to the Roman See, Celtic Christianity was rather the result of isolation than of protest. Their monasteries practised an almost extravagant asceticism that appealed to the emotional peculiarities of the race; and most noteworthy was the zeal of the monks in preserving the sound traditions of classical culture and developing a strikingly original artistic style.

In the rest of western Europe the period from the close of the fifth to the middle of the sixth century was marked by the downfall of Arian Christianity among the Teutonic peoples. This was partly due, as in the case of North Africa, to the imperial restoration under Justinian; in Spain to the political acumen of Reccared (586-601), who saw in the conversion of his people a means of reconciling the Roman provincials to Germanic domination. But much of the credit for the transformation must be given to the Franks,

whose king (Clovis, 466-511), after giving up paganism, set out on his career of conquest as the champion of orthodox Christianity. In Spain the Church took on a strongly national character, and its synods became legislative bodies whose acts regulated without distinction the affairs of both Church and State. Among the Franks, the Church became also closely related to the State, but in a place of dependence, not on an equal footing as in Spain. The adoption of Christianity by the Franks was characterized by great activity in monastic life and by the endowment of churches, but this external success was accompanied by a period of rough outlawry where every moral principle was violated. Hopeless as it seemed to stem the tide of this moral degeneracy, a widespread reform movement was led by Columbanus, an Irish monk, through his monastic foundation at Luxeuil in Burgundy, where work was done along purely Irish lines, without regard to existing diocesan organizations (543-615).

Gregory the Great

The establishment of the Lombard Kingdom in Italy in 568 brought about territorial changes which so altered the whole administrative order introduced by Justinian's conquests that his ecclesiastical system, which was a part of it, did not survive. In Byzantine Italy, which included the islands, parts of the coast of the peninsula, and its entire southern extremity, the Justinian policy of making the bishops a part of the

machinery of the State continued. Where the Lombards ruled there was no such regulation; all that was saved from the ruin of the conquest was the permission to practise the orthodox faith. There was an end of the carefully ordered system of Byzantine rule, for the bishops were shorn of all prerogatives but their pastoral relation to their flocks, and because they were now without rivals their influence was much enhanced both among the conquerors and the conquered. No one gained more from the change than the Bishop of Rome. After the time of Vigilius, his three successors were named by Justinian, and later, after a vacancy, the choice of the electors had to be assented to by the sovereign at Constantinople.

It was this State interference which the troubled affairs of Italy broke up; and just at a time when initiative was needed to guide the Roman See along unforeseen ways and in hazardous conditions, a man appeared fully equal to the task. Gregory the Great's family was of senatorial dignity, and from his youth the future pope was brought up with a view to a career in the imperial administration. Turning away from this prospect, Gregory entered a monastery, became familiar with the details of ecclesiastical polity at its chief centre, and also acquired a wider experience as official representative of the papal see at Constantinople. On his election in 590, Gregory was thoroughly prepared; he showed the characteristic traits of Roman statecraft—industry and consistency. The claims of his predecessors were explicitly re-

newed on every occasion. But the material basis of the claims was shrewdly recognized. Much of the pope's attention was given to the direction of the great landed estates owned by the Roman See in Italy, Sicily, Africa and even in the remote provinces of the East.

All the skill of a landlord, bent on improving and managing his property, was exerted in subservience to a far-sighted plan to make the Roman Church independent financially, and so enable it to exert a potent influence over men and affairs. The custom of sending the pallium, not originally a mark of ecclesiastical precedence, was vigorously pressed into service by the pope, and so emphasized that Gregory's regulation was accepted that only a bishop so dignified by the See of Rome could proceed to consecrate another bishop.

The Church of Milan, which had suffered much from the Lombard conquest, was glad to be restored to communion with Rome, and so find a powerful protection respected by the Lombard kings themselves. The pope's experienced diplomatic hand was seen especially in his relations with the heads of the Teutonic peoples. Reccared's conversion from Arianism was made use of to place on a firmer foundation the relations with the Church in Spain. With the Frankish monarchs every opportunity was used to assert in an effective shape the control over the French clergy and bishops, and the pope showed a clear-sighted understanding of the intricacies of Merovin-

gian politics,—the despair to-day of every student of history. Gregory selected Brunhilde, the unscrupulous queen, whose life was stained with almost every crime, as the most fit instrument, because she was the most powerful of the Merovingian rulers, to bring into effect the designs of papal policy. With Africa, the pope's efforts were unsuccessful, because the overthrow of Vandal power had, by freeing the African Church from its environment of persecution, revived its old self-conscious independence. In Illyricum, Justinian had placed its southern episcopal sees under the supervision of the Constantinopolitan patriarchate. This arrangement Gregory could not overthrow, though from time to time he succeeded in extending over it the authority of the Roman See.

In Italy the activity of the pope produced immediate and important results, largely through the influence of the officials who were charged by him with the supervision of the patrimonial estates of the Roman Church. These officers, who were taken exclusively from the clergy, effectively supervised the acts of the bishops under the immediate metropolitan jurisdiction of Rome; and as throughout all the territory still belonging to the Byzantine Empire, the bishops exercised certain rights as state officials, Gregory was able to centre in his own hands many of the details of civil administration. Among the Lombards, his influence was indirect, but it was powerful because it was exerted through the Queen Theodelinda, herself a Catholic, and Gregory's aim to bring over the

whole population, Teutonic and Latin, into communion with Rome, was crowned with success.

With the Eastern Empire, the upholding of Roman claims was a matter of more difficulty, for it was the policy of the government in Constantinople to make the patriarch of that see an equal in fact, as well as in name, of the Roman bishop. Gregory tried hard to induce the Emperor Maurice to deprive the patriarch of the eastern capital of the title of Ecumenical Patriarch, a designation which began to be given to him in the early years of the sixth century. But the pope's arguments fell on unwilling ears. It was the pope's interest in this matter which caused him to greet with such fulsome adulation the accession of the usurper Phokas, who made himself acceptable at Rome by a prompt acknowledgment of the plenary primacy of the Roman bishop.

The Church in England

But all these achievements of Gregory are in their ultimate results of inferior importance to his notable act in founding the Anglo-Saxon Church—a combination of missionary zeal and intelligent planning by which the whole course of the development of Western Christianity was to be moulded. No other Teutonic people had been brought to accept the Gospel under a plan of missionary campaign, outlined at Rome and with Roman clerics as its agents. Gregory's sending of Augustine and his monks in 596 to Saxon England was equivalent to the establishment,

in this new and hardy nation, of an ecclesiastical district, immediately dependent on the Roman See, where no ancient traditions of autonomous diocesan order could be brought up to arrest the tendencies of Roman centralization. The ancient population of Britain had disappeared under the savage conditions of conquest. Except in the mountains of Wales, the whole land in the course of the seventh century, with what was left of the Celtic population, acknowledged the overlordship of the Saxons.

So the ground was prepared and the first success of the missionaries from Rome in Kent (597) was followed by tribal conversions on a large scale. The foundations of bishoprics,—London in 604, Dorchester in 635, York in 627,—marked the stages of rapid progress. A period of reaction soon followed through the victories of the heathen king Penda of Mercia, and the Roman mission soon found itself confined to a small area in the south and southeast. But when the prospects of Saxon Christianity seemed darkest, a new and unexpected germinating centre of religious activity appeared, fostered by the labors of Irish-Scottish monks. Northumbria was again won through the conversion of its king Oswald while in banishment in Scotland. Penda was defeated and with him the pagan reaction collapsed. By 660 at least four-fifths of the Saxon land was under the supervision of the Scotch-Irish mission, whose chief seat was the famous island monastery at Iona. During this period of the advance of Celtic Christianity, the

progress of the Roman mission outside of Kent had been slow and tentative. It was not till after the middle of the century that the See of Winchester was established.

There is no clear proof that the two groups of missionaries, Roman and Irish, regarded themselves as representing rival and antagonistic religious organizations. Where this feeling existed, it was due to the bitter racial hatred of British Celt for Saxon,—an antipathy not decreased when the Saxon accepted Christianity. The isolation of the Irish Church was not the result of a policy anti-Roman in character, but rather was an accident due to the breaking up of the Roman civil provincial system through the long years of barbarian conquest. When Gregory's missionaries and their successors appeared on Saxon soil, they were not looked upon as interlopers by the representatives of Irish Christianity. Those who had worked with one group in the conversion of the country were freely received as associates by the other. In Ireland, as everywhere else in the West, the Roman See was revered; there was little tendency to antagonism, because conditions had given no opportunity for effective interference. Where differences were recognized, these were concerned only with subordinate details, such as the style of tonsure. The time of keeping Easter, on which point the Scotch-Irish monks followed an earlier usage of the Western Church, brought about such a visible difference between the two sets of converts, that strained relations

were inevitable. This was the question which came up for decision (664) before King Oswy of Bernicia, who decided in favor of the Roman custom of Easter observance. In other Saxon kingdoms, soon after, the same step was taken, with the consequence that the few Irish-Scotch missionaries who refused to comply left the country. Soon after, the remnant of the Saxon land which still held to paganism was converted by Wilfrid, a zealous propagandist of Roman claims to the fullest extent then known, with the result that every bishopric was united to the metropolitan See of Canterbury, which had itself been the first fruits of the papal mission. By the end of the seventh century, the Roman arrangement of reckoning Easter was accepted in Ireland, and not long after the isle of Iona gave up the primitive Celtic usage. In 717, those monks who refused to conform were driven from the community, but in other respects the monastic constitution of the Irish Church continued unchanged both in Ireland and in Scotland. In purely Saxon lands, the monasteries founded by the Celtic missionaries were centres of religious propaganda, but instead of keeping control of church administration, as in Ireland and Scotland, they were made subordinate to the diocesan bishops.

As time went on the ties of England with Rome were made closer; the only obstacle to a complete status of dependence was the growing power over church affairs of the various Saxon monarchs who acquired the overlordship of what had previously been

separated kingdoms. Close relations with the Roman See were sustained in extra-legal ways; especially through the literary influence of the monastic schools, the popularity of pilgrimages to Rome, and not the least because of the extension of the Benedictine rule in all monastic establishments, which meant everywhere the planting of centres where Rome was revered and Roman traditions in worship carefuly preserved. The Church soon acquired in England a peculiarly national character; the clergy came from the people, and understanding their needs and point of view they introduced throughout the principles of Latin educational methods. Most conspicuously successful in building up the various lines of church administration and expansion was Archbishop Theodore, himself a Greek by birth, whom Pope Vitalian consecrated in 668 and sent to England to perfect the existing organization by methods approved by Rome. New sees were created, the decrees of the five General Councils accepted at the Synod of Hatfield (680), which action meant that the position of the Roman See in the Three Chapters Controversy was taken as the model of orthodoxy. Tendencies of a similar character are to be noted in Theodore's introduction of the Roman liturgy and breviary, a step which imprinted a specifically Roman character on the Church in England, and which caused Theodore's work there to be used as a model when it was sought to bring other churches in closer dependence on the See of Rome.

Not a few Anglican writers have endeavored to discover additional grounds for the separation of the English Church from the Roman See by claiming that the Church of England from the first occupied an exceptional position in relation to papal jurisdiction. These arguments have generally taken a twofold direction. First it is shown that church life in Britain was not entirely interrupted by the Saxon conquest. It is true that the British Celts maintained their faith in those regions to which they had retired to escape from their conquerors, but the Church in Saxon England was not founded through the missionary efforts of the churches existing in these various Celtic tribes. The missionary work done in Saxon England by representatives of Celtic Christianity was effected by members of the Scottish-Irish Church. No one would desire to depreciate the missionary zeal of this church, and nothing but admiration can be felt for the personal character of its missionaries who worked with great success in various parts of Saxon England, but their work was soon assimilated by the stronger organization founded and developed by the representatives of the Roman See. The English Church is no more the product of Celtic tribal Christianity than is the English State the product of Celtic tribal custom.

The second line of argument is based on fact that the jurisdiction of the Roman See in the early period of the English Church was not exercised according to the rigid administrative and canonical principles that

are found everywhere existing after the time of Hildebrand. The centralized papal absolutism, as will be seen in the later chapters of this textbook, was gradually developed, but to claim that the Church of England was free from Rome at any time after its foundation is a mistake similar in kind as to claim that the American colonies were free from the English crown in the seventeenth century, simply because the royal prerogative was exercised loosely in America during the seventeenth and more rigidly in the eighteenth century.

During the early period where precedents may be quoted for showing how lightly Roman jurisdiction was recognized in the Church of England, even stronger examples might be quoted from the churches of France and Germany where, as we shall see, almost complete local autonomy not infrequently prevailed during the period of papal decline immediately prior to the Cluniac reform. Certainly in the literature of early English Christianity there was no such strong anti-Roman sentiment as can be found in Agnellus, the chronicler of the Church at Ravenna, or in Liutprand, the historian of Otto the Great.

The Church and the New Society

The time was now ripe for similar changes on a wider field, because the Teutonic peoples generally had as yet developed no institutions able to resist a centralizing ecclesiastical policy. Conversion meant progress, educational and social, as well as a re-

ligious change. Arianism gave Teutonic Christianity a national character, but when Arianism was exchanged for Catholic orthodoxy, there was a conscious introduction of novel elements, that in itself implied what might be called centripetal tendenices. In other words, the Germans by accepting the system of the Western Church had by this very fact to accommodate themselves to an alien environment. In the course of political changes, it was the Frankish monarchy which influenced both positively and negatively the course of church development. The State, as understood by the Germans, had simply the obligation of defence and the preservation of a crude form of justice. Self-help was the rule for all other types of activity. There were no limits, other than the two just enumerated, imposed upon the church organization when it was introduced among the Germanic peoples. Its task was outlined not by what the Germans recognized as their own needs, but by the ideals which the Church had inherited from its own history and from its contact with Roman civilization.

The peculiar institutions of the new national kingdoms reacted definitely upon the administration of the Church. The king lived upon the proceeds of his landed domains; the population was agricultural and the barbarian conquest was everywhere followed by the decay of city life. This gave an entirely new direction to church life, which had always hitherto centred in cities. In the country the land was held in great estates controlled by the followers of the

tribal chieftan or king, who in reward for aid given in the times of conquest bestowed upon them an allotment of territory. It was this class of great land owners who were entrusted with the work of administration of justice and the provision of defence. By the side of this aristocracy stood the bishop, in whom was invested the control of the landed estates of the Church, and who, besides, represented in a visible form what the Church stood for as the guide and protector of society. Just as the king relied upon the territorial aristocracy and from it drew his counsellors and military leaders, so he depended upon the support, material and moral, of the episcopate. Bishops were summoned to give advice, and because in so many ways they were called to perform the functions of the secular nobility, their own interests became largely identical with those of the class they constantly acted with. In the cities, the bishop's position as leader of the community lost prestige simply because the city was no longer the administrative unit. The count of the "Gau" was the chief local official, and he overshadowed the authority of the bishop, but it was not uncommon in the interests of the landed aristocracy for both the count and the bishop to be taken from the same family.

Undoubtedly, the most important influence in the life of the mediæval Church comes from its control of vast landed estates. It was not simply a question of pious bequests made in the hope of securing spiritual privileges. Numbers of small landed pro-

prietors turned over their holdings to the Church in order to benefit by the protection afforded by the recognition of the principles of Roman law. This legal system current in the Church was much more considerate of the rights of private ownership than the rules of tribal customary law which governed the relations of a free peasantry. In this way the Church as landlord became entitled to certain dues and services from all classes of its tenants. The granting of immunities from taxation or from the legal jurisdiction of royal officials also strengthened the autonomous position of the Church; or rather of institutions belonging to the Church, because it was really the individual church or the individual monastery to which these grants were made, and not the religious community as a whole.

Another important change, as the mediæval period begins to develop, is the enlargement of the diocesan boundaries. Previously the bishop's jurisdiction had been confined to the limits of the city which gave the name to his see. Now it began to be extended to a larger geographical or political division, and so included within it smaller aggregations. This change was introduced by Justinian into Italy and gradually extended from there throughout the West. Even at an earlier period, there had been priests with country charges, in most cases on land owned by city churches or belonging to secular proprietors. There is proof that the Teutonic conquest gave great impetus to the erection of church buildings, oratories

and shrines. In country districts, according to Germanic law, the proprietor of the land had absolute disposal over the church fabric erected upon it; he could use as he saw fit the income of the priest who served the church, could appoint whom he would, and might dismiss him at will. Naturally this meant a decided lessening of the bishop's power over his own clergy. Only where the country churches were on land directly owned by the Church, did the bishop's jurisdiction actually extend; he could appoint a member of his own city clergy to look after them, control his conduct, and appropriate for the use of the see whatever income was received. By degrees the bishop's oversight was extended to all of the clergy in the diocese, and on the other hand, the country church acquired a more independent position in relation to the owner of the land, but the effort to limit lay control met with obstinate resistance.

Closely connected with the increase of country congregations in the fifth and sixth centuries, was the building up of the parish system, i.e. of independent units economically provided for by the community in which was the church fabric, whose minister, too, had the right to provide for all the spiritual needs of his people. In regard to the administration of baptism this was an innovation, for previously church buildings in the country were either oratories or memorials of martyrs; those who used them as their spiritual homes had to repair to the town church, over which the bishop presided, to receive baptism, hear

sermons or secure the administration of ecclesiastical penance. The minister in charge of the country parish came to be called, in the sixth and seventh centuries, archpriest. The growth of this system was helped by the decentralizing inclination of the Teutonic peoples. In England the bounds of the parish followed the previously existing local divisions, the "hundreds", and it should not fail to be noted that Theodore of Canterbury did pioneer work in organizing the administration of the Church of England, by founding dioceses and creating parishes, with the result that in England the Church set out to do its work fully equipped, prepared to meet the local conditions of a Germanic folk, agricultural in character, among whom the traditions of the Roman municipality had practically disappeared.

The New Penitential System

In the crude state of society, no part of the Church's organization was so adjusted to deal with social order and violence as its disciplinary or pentiential system, especially in the modifications it received in Western Christendom. By the side of the public practice of penance, there was introduced a private and personal treatment of serious cases, which were not known by the community, but which were voluntarily brought before the bishop by the guilty parties. Such individuals were, at the bishop's discretion, when due satisfaction was exacted, restored to the communion of the Church. Moreover, actual excom-

munication, which had now become an engine of social outlawry, enforced against heretical sects by the secular government, became restricted in its use by the Church and in place of it there were imposed various penitential practices. The change was all the more a natural one because of the growth of monastic life; a monk who had violated the rules of his order or was unworthy, could be disciplined more effectively by the application of a definite scale of penalties than by recourse to the final act of cutting him off from the community. This private administration of penance was in the sixth and seventh centuries applied only to the clergy; probably the avoidance of public scandal among new converts may have suggested its adoption as an alternative to the old system of public penance, which was still enforced upon the laity.

It is necessary, therefore, to examine the customs of monastic life when one is investigating the origins of auricular confession as it is found in Latin Christianity. In monasteries, it was regarded as an evidence of humility for a monk to confess his errors of thought or inclination. Such was the custom which, beginning in the monastic establishments of the Scotch-Irish Church, was rapidly adopted by monks of other rules. When transferred to the secular and lay world, it brought into existence the regular system which is now understood under the terms "auricular confession". What is equally important was the substitution of the priest for the bishop in the control of this new penitential system. He, not the

bishop, decided when the penitent should be readmitted to share the Eucharistic Feast. In order to lay the foundation of an orderly dealing with derelections, great and small, special penitential books were prepared, arranging for each special sin an appropriate penalty. Fasting was the widely accepted compensation, and when practised for a short time under hard or unusual conditions, might be taken as an alternative for ascetic discipline of a less rigorous nature lasting over a year. Through St. Columbanus of Luxeuil, this practice was introduced into the Frankish Church, where it found a ready acceptance because it so completely harmonized with the Teutonic custom of the Wehrgeld, by which infractions of the law might be atoned for by the guilty party or his relatives upon the payment of a sum of money, the amount being determined by the severity of the act or the status of the injured individual. The extension of the monastic penitential system is only one of many examples of the preponderating influence among the Teutonic peoples of ascetic communities.

While the new social conditions favored this extension, the influence of personality cannot be neglected. Benedict of Nursia (480-543) was the revered founder of the systematically ordered community of monks in western Europe. Few authentic details are reported of his life, but from what we do know it was his connection with ecclesiastical miracles that gave the widespread repute to the admirable regulations he imposed in his monastery of Monte Cassino. Appar-

ently an incident of the Teutonic invasion caused a general extension of this local rule. In 580, the Lombards destroyed the monastery; the monks fled to Rome and were given a refuge by Pelagius II (579-590) in the neighborhood of the Lateran palace. In this way Gregory the Great came to know them and encouraged the adoption of their rule in the monasteries founded by him. This patronage was enough to produce a rapid expansion in France, Spain and England, and St. Benedict's rule soon supplanted that of Columbanus even in institutions whose founders were Celtic missionaries. Among the Franks the owner of the ground on which the monastery stood acquired definite rights over it. The abbot could be named by a secular landlord, and it was regarded as natural that monasteries of royal foundation should be largely dependent upon the king, and they were used as valuable sources of revenue.

The Church and Education

Notable changes were brought about in education by the Teutonic invasions. In the first place, except for the clergy, higher education in any way deserving the name had died out in western Europe. In Italy alone the old schools, the heritage of the classical age, survived where the seven liberal arts were professed, —grammar, rhetoric, dialectic, arithmetic, music, geometry, and astronomy; in some cases, too, instruction in the civil law continued to be given. In the early period of the Church the secular schools were

frequented by the clergy, a custom approved by St. Augustine. After the barbarian conquests, as the old schools generally disappeared, special provisions had to be made for training the clergy in reading, singing of the psalms, and in the conduct of church ceremonial generally. We find Gallican and Spanish synods making provision for this kind of instruction early in the sixth century, but the example of Gregory the Great, who condemned the old schools of the professional rhetoricians as seed-beds of paganism, prevented the advancement towards higher standards of learning. This point of view was not shared by Cassiodorus, the prime minister of Theodoric the Ostrogoth (480-575), who after his retirement to a monastery laid the foundation for the pursuit of higher learning for his own and other monks. Works of a condensed, crude and encyclopædic character were prepared which preserved some of the elements of learning, Christian and pagan; the introduction of libraries in monasteries was encouraged, and in this way they became the chief seats of learning in western Europe. Centuries passed before there grew up along with the halting gift of literary expression, some creative power in literature. Education meant the mastery of the scraps and fragments of classical antiquity preserved in jejune encyclopædic collections and in badly digested textbooks. But even with such unsatisfactory guidance the Teutonic peoples had opened to them the avenues of intellectual progress. Such men as Isidore of Seville, in the Visigothic

Church of Spain, and Bede in Saxon England (674-735) did, with all their limitations, noble pioneer educational work. And here, too, Theodore of Canterbury must be credited with the organization in England of cathedral and monastic schools which became important cultural centres. Those who benefited from their existence were primarily the members of monastic establishments; the secular clergy had only the rudiments of an education. All that was expected of the latter was the ability to read and understand portions of the Latin liturgy. As to the lay members of the church their training was even slighter, and what they knew came filtered to them through the clerical order.

The Advance of Islam

More and more, the Teutonic peoples grew to be the decisive factors in Christendom, but in this evolution not a little was contributed by the remarkable spread of the religion of Islam over lands where Christianity had originated in the earliest age of the Church. Mohammed's career as an acknowledged and victorious leader was comparatively short, for he was over forty when the call came, and his death occurred in 632 when he was sixty-two. His religious system, influenced as it was by Judaism and by Christian Gnostic sects, bore the impress of a strong and original personality, who undertook in the moral, religious and ceremonial prescriptions of the Q'ran to organize the Arab tribes for propaganda and conquest. With-

in a decade after the prophet's death, the two great empires in the East, Persia and Rome, both contiguous to what had been before to them the *terra incognita* of the Arabian peninsula, had suffered enormous territorial losses—Egypt, Syria, and Mesopotamia. By 650, Northern Africa had been conquered as far as Tripoli; Persia had been overrun and the island of Cyprus taken. In 693, after a civil war between the various claimants to the Caliphate lasting over forty years, the advance began again. India was attained on the east, the Caucasus on the north, Asia Minor and Thrace invaded. A defeat of a great fleet sent to take Constantinople brought a halt in the advance of Islam (717) in eastern Europe.

In the West there were further successes. The conquest of North Africa was completed in 709, and two years afterwards Spain was invaded, and before 720 the Westgothic monarchy had collapsed; the Pyrenees were then passed and towns in southern Frankland, Narbonne, Carcassone and Nimes fell into the hands of the Moslems. It was Charles Martel, the leader of the Franks, who by inflicting on the marauding hordes a decisive defeat at Poitiers, barred the way to further conquest, and soon afterward the Pyrenees became the limits of the Mohammed world in the West. Dissensions among the Moorish Emirs in Spain enabled the small group of Westgothic fugitives and Basques to organize a Christian kingdom, which, with slow advance, ultimately forced back the Moslems to a line approximately dividing the Iberian

peninsula in half. By these Moslem conquests the Mediterranean became an Arab lake in its western portion. Arab fleets preserved their mastery over it and made periodic attacks on Sicily and the other large islands, and ravaged the Frankish and Italian shore lines. As a consequence, western Europe remained practically shut off from international trade, a situation which had a decisive influence on the religious condition of the West. From this time the needs and problems of city life, as developed by trade on a large scale, had hardly to be considered by the Church. This meant that so far as church administration was concerned, traditional lines were followed, but the crude condition of society also encouraged the building up of barriers against any kind of progress.

In all that civilization stands for, the Byzantine Empire was decidedly in advance of western Europe. In Islam itself the union of widely separated territories under the stimulus of a common religion, a common polity, allied with possibilities of trade intercourse between various nationalities, manifested itself in a social organization which found its intellectual and æsthetic expression in the flourishing cities of the Iberian peninsula and in the prosperity of the lands under the Caliphate of Bagdad. The Arab conquerors for a time practised a policy of toleration in the East. After the Arab conquest had led to the permanent occupation of eastern lands, the Nestorian Church attained a unique position as the centre of

cultural influence among the conquerors. Members of this church held high positions as secretaries and doctors in the courts of the Khalifs, and it was through the medium of the Syriac translations of Greek originals that the Arabs came into contact with the great storehouses of occidental science and philosophy. Indirectly, therefore, the intellectual renaissance in western Europe in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries may be credited to the educational activities of the Nestorians who promoted the growth of Arabic learning.

The rapidity of the Moslem conquests in the provinces of the Eastern Empire was due to something more than the fanatical bravery of the followers of the new religion. Much must be ascribed to the hatred felt for the centralizing despotism of Constantinople in enforcing dogmatic uniformity. In Egypt, the Monophysites hailed the Arabs as deliverers; the province was surrendered into their hands through the betrayal of a Coptic general. Bishops, sees, and church buildings belonging to the orthodox Greek-speaking party were turned over to the conquerors by the native inhabitants. For eighty years the Greek patriarchate of Alexandria was vacant, and even when reoccupied it never regained its influence. Though in Syria the orthodox party was stronger, the Monophysites won the upper hand finally, simply because the conquerors favored them as a Christian element inimical both ecclesiastically and politically to the government at Constantinople. While the

balance of power was being shifted to the native Christian churches which had felt for so long the heavy hand of imperial repression, large masses of Christians accepted the Moslem faith in southern Egypt. Christianity disappeared there entirely; it was only in the more remote region of Abyssinia, which withstood the shock of conquest, that the semblance of a national church survived. In what had been Latin-speaking Africa, the Arab conquest produced even more disastrous results. By the eleventh century there were only five churches left under the Bishop of Carthage.

In Spain the mass of the population, to whom the Visigothic rule meant an oppressive land system under great landlords and the selfish control by an ecclesiastical oligarchy of the administration in its smallest details, accepted without reluctance the Arab and Berber domination. The Jews especially, who were an important factor in the population, welcomed the Moslems as saviors, and the peasants had no difficulty in becoming converts to the new order. Wherever Islam prevailed, full autonomy was granted to the Christian communities. The bishops were formally recognized as the responsible heads, in whose hands the administration of the law, both civil and criminal, according to the Roman system, was left. Even the death penalty was put at their disposition. Exceptional in the denial of such privileges was Spain, where the Moslem emirs summoned synods and nominated candidates from the Christian clergy for advancement to the episcopate.

CHAPTER II.

THE CHURCH IN THE CAROLINGIAN EMPIRE

IN tracing the advance westward of Mohammedanism, we have passed beyond the chronological limits of the internal history of the Church during the seventh and eighth centuries. Theological discussions again became important when the Emperor Heraclius (610-641) restored to the Empire some of the eastern and southern provinces previously taken by the Persians. In order to conciliate their Monophysite population he, acting with the advice of the patriarch Sergius, issued a compromise formula according to which the one Christ was endowed with a divine-human energy, itself the spring of every act of a single personality. This was successful in bringing back many Monophysites. Later, after further debate, this compromise was dropped for the expresssion "One Will", in which the two natures, divine and human, were manifested,— the Ecthesis of Heraclius (638). This formula was suspected by the West, where the phraseology of Chalcedon was loyally respected, and the division produced disastrous results in Africa, paving the way for the Arab conquest. In vain Constans II (642-688) forbad, by the "Typus", the discussion of the question. The advocates of the "Two-Will" theory were active in Rome, and secured the co-

öperation of Pope Martin I, who paid for his sympathy by deprivation of his see and by banishment at the hands of the emperor (653). After this, communion with the East was for a time interrupted; then, as the importance of keeping a hold on the Italian peninsula became impressed upon the authorities at Constantinople, a change of direction in ecclesiastical policy took place at the Sixth Ecumenical Council (Constantinople, 680) where Monothelitism (the doctrine of One Will), including one of its supporters, Pope Honorius, was formally anathematized. This action was altogether acceptable in the West, but caused in the East a schism among the Syrians, who separated from the Byzantine Church, and who still, under the name of Maronites, preserve a semi-independent existence. The Monophysites outside the limits of the Empire, now narrowed by the Moslem conquest, paid no attention to the decree, and of course it could not be enforced among them.

The Genesis of Papal Independence

All attempts to conciliate the Church in Italy and to retain the Peninsula as a province of the Empire failed because of the territorial gains made by the Lombards. The splitting up of the country into small isolated territories, still more or less nominally subject to Constantinople, was the indirect result of the Lombard invasion, and powerfully contributed to increase the power of the local bishops. More particularly was this the case in Ravenna and Rome.

The work of defence was taken over by the municipality, after the imperial authorities had shown themselves unable to protect the citizens against the much-feared Lombard raiders. The rôle of leader in this accidentally developing local autonomy was naturally assumed by the bishop, for it must be remembered that the struggle with the Lombards was religious as well as racial. Being in possession and in control of independent military power, the Bishops of Rome were able to withstand the imperial mandate, refused to consent to the revival of Monothelitism by Philip Bardanes (711-713), and resisted the attempts of Justinian II to limit papal authority (692, 705, 707). Yet this autonomy was not systematically worked out, for at this time each newly elected Roman Bishop had to secure the assent of the imperial representative at Ravenna, the exarch, before his election was held to be valid. But the road to political power without any real competition from civil officials was opened to the bishops of Italian sees, as Byzantine administration became disintegrated. In Lombard territory, the conversion of the Germanic invaders to orthodoxy brought the local churches under the kind of royal supervision which prevailed among the Westgoths and the Franks. Appeals to Rome stopped. The See of Milan had again an actual metropolitan jurisdiction, with its bishop at the head of what might be called the Lombard Church.

A further advance of the Roman See towards independent sovereignty and actual overlordship was

introduced by the campaign against image-worship in the East, where under Leo the Isaurian (716-741) a determined effort was made to put a stop to the excessive reverence paid to representations of Christ and the Saints. This popular devotion was largely encouraged by the oriental monks, and it may be that the government used the controversy as to the legitimacy of image-worship in order to diminish the influence of the monks, who in the preceding theological controversies had often stoutly resisted the imperial edicts. In 726 an order was issued directing the removal from the churches of all images. In Italy the attempt to apply it caused revolts in Ravenna, Naples and Rome. Gregory II (715-731) took the lead in resisting the imperial decree and prevented the removal from the basilica of St. Peter of the famous bronze statue of the Apostle. All taxes were refused, and the bishop took upon himself to name the dux, or head of the civil administration in the city. This dissension between the emperor and the local Roman Church was taken advantage of by the Lombard king, Liutprand (713-744), who allied himself with the exarch, hoping soon to annex Rome and its adjoining territory to his dominions.

The Roman See was in a hazardous position. The bishoprics in southern Italy and eastern Illyricum were placed under the jurisdiction of the patriarch of Constantinople; much of its patrimonial domains was now in territory held by the Arabs, and wherever the imperial mandate or Lombard control prevailed,

the source of income was shut off. To secure allies against the danger of annihilation was impossible, for Charles Martel would risk nothing to protect the papacy. The Iconoclastic troubles reached their climax in the East in the reign of Constantine V (741-775). Crowds of monks went into exile, many seeking refuge in western Europe. Finally, under the Empress Irene, there was a period of reaction, during which a general council was held at Nicæa (787), which permitted modified forms of reverence to pictures and sculptured objects.

St. Boniface

In the West the whole situation was modified by political changes involving the Franks and the Lombards, which profoundly influenced the destinies of the papacy. The tribal monarchy of the Franks had been weakened by internecine strife, the result of partitions in the royal house of Clovis. This centrifugal movement seemed to have no limit until the Arnolfings appeared with a series of able men, exercising as mayors of the palace royal power under the names of the feeble Merovingians and so put a stop to separatist tendencies. The most vigorous of all these strong executives was Charles Martel (714-741), famous for his victory over the Moslems in 732, almost equally well known for the way in which he used the property of bishoprics and abbeys to promote his nationalist policies and force recalcitrant Frankish nobles to accept him as sole ruler of Frank-

land. In a considerable part of Austrasia, the north-eastern division of Frankish territory, and in the ring of dependent Teuton peoples still further east, Christianity had a weak position; where it had previously existed it almost disappeared when the Roman provincial cities became deserted. In Hesse, Thuringia and Bavaria, the new faith had very little hold; there were settlements of Scotch-Irish monks scattered about this field but no church organization, no systematic missionary effort. Only in the neighborhood of these monastic settlements were the rough inhabitants of the countryside influenced. Everywhere else, even when the traditional polytheism was not kept intact, priests and people, though nominally Christian, adhered to a faith in which the old and new elements were strangely intermixed.

The work of gathering up these scattered threads, of giving them coherence, and making the fragments useful for further expansion, was taken up by Saxon monks trained in the spirit of loyalty to Roman principles of administration. Willibrord worked in Frisia with good results, but even more successful was Wynfrith, better known under his Latin name of Boniface, to whom Pope Gregory II gave full powers to organize German Christianity (718). On his elevation to the episcopate he took an oath binding himself to place the churches in his charge under the immediate jurisdiction of Rome. He pledged himself, too, to refuse fellowship with every bishop who failed to observe the same standards of strict loyalty

to the Roman See. During his whole life Boniface remained a faithful and efficient intrument of Roman propaganda. After finishing his task in one district, he would at the pope's direction pass to another, reproducing under changed forms and aims the rigid ideals of the Roman provincial government during the golden period of the Empire. In 732, he received the pallium and metropolitan rank at the hands of Gregory III. But he was not only distinguished as the founder and organizer of bishoprics. Everywhere he relied on monastic institutions, and many monks and nuns were brought from England to act as agents in founding new communities. Backed as he was by Charles Martel, Boniface extended the limits of definite papal organization from the northeastern borders of Italy to the regions of the Low Countries along the course of the middle and lower Rhine.

Boniface's work stimulated an active revival in the Frankish Church generally. Lay control of bishoprics and abbeys, which meant increased power of the landed aristocracy, was definitely limited. This did not imply anything resembling a free Church, because in place of the local landlord there was substituted the sovereignty of the mayor of the palace who called synods together, proposed, after consultation with the bishop and nobles, schemes of reform, gave them legislative sanction and imposed upon his subordinate ecclesiastical official the duty of enforcing them. In general, however, through the influence of Boniface, the principles of English church organization were car-

ried out among the Franks through a strict enforcement of the diocesan system. It meant, too, the introduction of the Benedictine rule, the recognition of Roman ritual as the norm for church services and devoted loyalty to the Bishop of Rome as head of the Church. That the national spirit of the Franks did not easily accommodate itself to this campaign of centralization is seen in the fact that Boniface, disgusted with the laxity which still prevailed, withdrew from his episcopate and found a martyr's death among the Frisian pagans (755).

The properties of churches and monasteries alienated by Charles Martel were still left in the possession of the actual occupants, but arrangements were made for ultimate reversion to the original owners, subject, however, to any future disposition by the head of the Frankish nation. Apathetic though the majority of the clergy and laity were to this new ecclesiastical policy of "thorough", there were those who sympathized with it, among them being Bishop Chrodegang of Metz (742-766), famous for his organization of the clergy of his cathedral into a semi-monastic community — a precedent much followed afterwards in western Europe.

The Papacy and the Franks

Before the middle of the eighth century, some form of unity was being reëstablished in the West. The period of disintegration caused by the invasion was clearly over, and it was through the Franks that cen-

tralization began and the movement was actually furthered by the condition of international politics. It meant much to Pippin, Charles Martel's son, that the formal recognition of his sovereignty over the Franks should come from the papacy, and when Pope Zacharias sanctioned the transfer of the crown from the decadent Merovingians, he was bidding for future favors. The time to show gratitude was close at hand, for the popes were living in constant terror of Lombard aggression. The Byzantine provinces, the Exarchate and Pentapolis had already been taken; it was not likely that Rome could escape. During Pope Stephen's visit to France, by the treaties of Pontheon and St. Denys, Pippin pledged himself to restore to the Roman See its private domains held by the Lombard king, and, what was more strikingly original, to turn over to the Duchy of Rome the conquered Byzantine territories. As the *de facto* ruler of the duchy was the pope, this meant a significant increment of territorial sovereignty (754).

One limitation, however, must be recorded; though the emperor's consent was no longer asked in papal elections, his authority was still acknowledged, and all documents contained the year of his reign. It was proposed in the treaties that Pippin should receive the title of Patrician, probably with the intention that he should exert over the newly acquired territory the rights of the Byzantine exarch. As a matter of fact, the plan outlined at this time was left to Pippin's heir, Charles, to put into operation. His expedition

across the Alps in 773 brought about the downfall of the Lombard kingdom, but there was no cession of the territories mentioned in the treaty, for Charles in renewing them had inserted the insignificant clause that the pope should be obliged to prove his title. What Hadrian (772-795) actually received was the administration of Rome and a few other cities under Frankish oversight. Both Rome and Ravenna became Frankish cities and bishoprics. The year 772 is the last in which the name of the eastern emperor is cited on documents; from 781 begins the official reckoning according to the years of the pontificate. So the Frankish constitution of the Church was introduced into northern Italy with its mixture of secular control and diocesan regulation.

Closely connected with the period of Frankish intervention is the so-called Donation of Constantine, evidently intended to furnish the crude allies of the Roman See in the north with predigested historical knowledge. The document, after telling the legend of the miraculous healing of the first Christian emperor by Pope Sylvester, relates how the emperor in his gratitude for his recovery assigned to the See of Rome preëminence over the four eastern patriarchates, and in fact over all churches, the control of matters of belief and worship, in virtue of its bishops' succession from St. Peter. It provided for the transfer to him of private domains belonging to the emperor, and for the rendering of ceremonial honors to the clergy of the city, making them equal

of the senators. To the bishop the imperial insignia were assigned, and the emperor did him personal service by leading the horse on which he rode. Finally there were extensive concessions of sovereignty over "all the provinces, places and cities of Italy and the regions of the West", with the reserved right of overlordship to the emperor, who removed therefore his residence to Byzantium. This falsification was almost certainly prepared in Rome, probably in the time of Hadrian (781), though some authorities prefer an even earlier date. Though the Donation made little impression on Charles, it proved an invaluable aid later in furthering the political aims of the papacy.

Charles the Great and the Church

The conquests of the great Frankish monarch worked mighty results in the religious condition of western Europe. New territory was brought in, and lands never forming a part of the original Roman Empire were provided with churches and missionaries. Especially were the hitherto untouched Germanic tribes affected, such as the Saxons and Frisians, but Slavonic peoples were also influenced. Numerous new bishoprics were founded and Christianity was extended by opening up new lands to Germanic expansion. Wherever there was opposition, as among the Saxons, paganism was put down with a heavy hand, heathen practices and the refusal of baptism being made in 786 punishable by death. Charles used

the Church as a civilizing and social instrument. His bishops carried out his orders, and through him was constructed that idea of a Christian commonwealth resting on a centralized church organization, which survived for so long the destruction of his own empire. The ecclesiastical policy of his immediate predecessors, Pippin and Charles Martel, was applied everywhere in the fullest detail so far as concerned the organization of dioceses and parishes. Episcopal control and discipline were defined and made effective; the tithing system was introduced; in monasteries the rule of St. Benedict prevailed under the supervision of the diocesan, yet the autonomy of the community remained. Episcopal sees were subjected to metropolitan jurisdiction, and the word archbishop came at this time into general use. Materially the Church gained large accessions of landed property, yet at the same time the control of the royal power over all types of ecclesiastical foundations was made more complete by the very fact of these generous donations.

The age was marked also by a general revival of learning, Charles' court being frequented by scholars, and there was a remarkable increase in literary productivity. Great care was given to the copying of manuscripts and the preparation of church service-books. In all this development the Roman norm was followed; for example, Roman canonical collections were made authoritative, the Roman liturgy and Roman breviary accepted throughout the extent of the

Carolingian Empire. Interesting, also, is the rise of a self-conscious community which shows itself in the attitude adopted by the Carolingian Church in the Iconoclastic Controversy, in which a line was taken altogether independent of the Eastern Church of 787. More important even was the question of Adoptionism, a revival of Nestorianism in the Spanish Church, probably due to the introduction there of Eastern Christians in the train of the Arab conquerors. This controversy, too, was decided by a series of imperial synods, held under Alcuin, Charles' most famous ecclesiastical adviser. A more questionable instance of the same independence may be seen in the addition to the Nicene symbol of the word "filioque", which the Carolingian theologians did not hesitate to adopt in order to bring the Creed into more complete harmony with the teaching of St. Augustine.

The climax of this whole movement came with the restoration of the Empire of the West by the coronation of Charles in Rome in 800 as emperor, an act which he had attempted to arrange diplomatically with the eastern emperor, but which Pope Leo III apparently carried out without securing the Frankish monarch's consent to those details of the service by which papal privileges were over-emphasized. Charles' Church, be it remembered, was in every sense a State Church, i.e. the State was in all relations the predominant partner. All bishops were appointed by the emperor and he was the supreme court for hearing ecclesiastical cases. The canon law was a

part of Carolingian legislation, the property of abbeys was treated as if it were a part of the royal domain, and all lands were liable to taxation and other obligations. In the visitations of the royal officials, the Missi, the clergy were treated in the same way as laymen, and even the church synod became the organ of the emperor's will.

The pope had no place outside this system; he was but the first bishop of the Empire, and was held to be the subject of the emperor. He addressed the emperor as his master; papal documents were dated by the years of the imperial reign; the Byzantine ceremony of genuflection, and adoration to the emperor, was a part of the coronation service of 800; and more significant still was the action of Charles at Rome in deciding whether certain charges made against Leo were or were not justified. The patrimony of the Roman See was administered by royal officials, dogmatic questions decided without asking the pope's advice, and sometimes final decisions made in contradiction to his wishes, as in the case of image-worship and the addition of "filioque" to the Creed. Externally and internally, the control of church affairs was in Charles' hands. Appeals to Rome are not recorded; and altogether, in the Carolingian system, the pope had a position in which reverence for the honored apostolic see was not allowed to be translated into juristic concessions of sovereignty either in the ecclesiastical or the civil sphere.

The Papacy and the Later Carolingians

The far-sighted plans of the emperor collapsed under the weak rule of his successors by which his Empire was divided. During the whole of the ninth century, the centralization of the Empire suffered a process of disintegration; the apex of the system disappeared first; what was permanent was the scheme for those wide cultural activities of the Church which had been so carefully outlined by the founder of the Empire. Their original connection with and dependence upon the State was forgotten and they were taken up and treated as if they had been always the peculiar prerogatives of a centralized autonomous religious organization.

Under the Carolingians constructive missionary work went on, marked by the creation of the See of Hamburg (united with Bremen 848), whose first bishop was Auskar, under whose auspices Christianity was introduced into Scandinavian countries. In monastic life, Benedict of Agnani (d. 821) was zealous in enforcing the standards of his namesake of Nursia. The movement initiated by him was directed against Humanism, which had found its chief supporters in the monasteries, and in place of educational and classical ideals he restored the obligation of manual labor as the chief feature of monastic discipline.

In the years of civil strife between the successors of Charles, the clergy stood on the whole for the side

which proclaimed the necessity of national unity, but the important result of these years was the elevation of papal claims which rose in the scale as the imperial power became discredited. The superiority of the pope to the emperor began to be freely asserted, the advocates of the papacy going so far as to proclaim that by the pope's hands alone, through the ceremonies of the coronation, could the imperial dignity be validly conferred. The ideal was developed of a Church cut loose from all dependence upon the State, ruled by the pope, to whom belonged all power upon earth. This conception did not find its way to acceptance without opposition; even in the time of the weak Louis the Pious, Charles' heir, the attempt of the ecclesiastical order to act by itself was strenuously resisted, and later on, in the same century, there is more than one instance of an attempt to revive the right of the emperor's supervision over all elections. But there can be no question as to the line of development; the papacy was enforcing its claims amid an opposition which was growing weaker and less effective every decade.

Nicholas I

Nominally the Carolingian Settlement of the Church was accepted, but it was being slowly undermined. The social and political conditions of Europe proved its inherent weakness. Northmen and Saracen raids, the former along the west line of the Atlantic and the German Ocean, and the second in the Mediterranean,

caused terror and devastation which secular rulers were powerless to remedy. In the western division of the Empire, as the chief executive failed to carry on the needs of government, there came into being a system of inherited local functions associated with the ownership of land. In this situation, landed property meant the control of local sovereignty, and the rivalry was so sharp for its possession that no discrimination was made between lay and church property. Unable to secure protection from a weak central executive, the bishops and abbots sought to find some way in which they might stand on equal terms with the lay landed aristocracy in order to maintain their hold on church property, and in the more intangible sphere of moral and religious influence, place themselves in a position where their superiority could not be questioned. As among the secular nobility there was a struggle for supremacy between the count and the duke, over both of whom the authority of the king grew to be nominal, so between the higher ecclesiastics, the metropolitans and the bishops of their respective provinces, there arose a contest as to whether the head of the province could directly depress the diocesan bishops to the rank of under-officials whose sole function was to carry out his mandates. Such in effect had been the idea of the Carolingian Church system.

The question became acute under Archbishop Hincmar of Rheims, who, backed by the royal power, claimed to exercise to the full the metropolitical juris-

diction of his see. In his province, the suffragan bishops had to meet this double combination, and they appealed to the supreme sovereignty of the papacy as superior to either power. The discussion merits some elaboration, because it gave occasion to the celebrated falsification known as the pseudo-Isidorian Decretals (the collection of Isidorus Mercator, 851 or 852). Old documents were refurbished and new ones, presumably of great antiquity, were produced, — the work of skilful forgers, who aimed thus to authenticate the current episcopal arguments against the exercise of metropolitical power,—but the freedom of the Church from lay control and supervision was just as emphatically insisted upon. The church organization in these decretals is the papal system; every case of importance must be appealed to Rome; no synodical acts can be validated, no synod even called without papal approval. So this marvellous collection gives us a Church in which the pope is the virtual creator of all inferior church officers, is dogmatically infallible and is the corner-stone of the entire structure.

Such was the system which, founded on forged historical documents, Pope Nicholas I (858-867) put into working order. The grounds of intervention were nicely chosen. When a Carolingian monarch, Lothair II, would have repudiated his wife, his act was supported by the episcopate of the kingdom. The pope quashed the whole proceeding and called Lothair's bishops to a full accounting, and the king

himself had finally to submit. The next step was to reduce the metropolitan claims. This was carried through vigorously when Hincmar deposed one of his suffragans, Rothad of Soissons, at a diocesan synod. Rothad appealed to Rome and his cause was there decided on the basis of the Forged Decretals. Hincmar was obliged to give way. Troubles with the Saracen invasions on the coast near Rome and incessant strife with the local nobility of Rome obstructed further advance along the road to papal autocracy. Nicholas' successors were for the moment either weak or opportunists, and the traditions of his strong rule remained quiescent. In France, too, the famous decretals were forgotten, but precedents had been made that were appealed to later on.

Conflict with the Eastern Church

Not only in the West, however, was Nicholas intent on maintaining the papal prerogatives. He had on his hands also a bitter controversy with Constantinople on questions of jurisdiction and the relative rights of the two sees.

Since the disintegration of the Frankish Empire, the Slavic peoples in the East had looked to Constantinople as their religious centre. This tendency had been helped by the military revival in the East under Michael III, who defeated the Bulgarians in the Balkan peninsula. Conspicuous for their missionary efforts, which added new regions to the Christianity of the East, were the brothers Methodius and Constan-

tine (later called Cyril), who made themselves famous as apostles of the Slavic race. Constantine, a Greek by birth, became acquainted at Thessalonica with the language of the Slavonic settlers in the neighborhood. Through his knowledge of Slavonic speech he prepared an alphabet and translated portions of the Scriptures and the eastern liturgy for the use of the converts. His labors were soon rewarded with success, as he was ably seconded by Methodius, who devoted himself to the work of organizing the new communities (864). Coincident with the conversion of the northern Slavs in Moravia, Boghoris, the Bulgarian prince, was baptized by a Greek bishop and was followed by the mass of his people, though the introduction of Christianity was strongly resisted by the nobility. Boghoris, probably moved by political reasons, entrusted to the Roman and Eastfrankish Church the organization of the Bulgarian converts. Nicholas I was not slow in seizing the opportunity, and the Bulgarian people became an ecclesiastical dependency of the Roman See; he was also shrewd enough to enlist Cyril and Methodius in the ranks of his missionaries.

This intrusion was most unwelcome at Constantinople, where Nicholas had already taken a hand in the dispute as to the legitimate occupation of the patriarchal chair. Photius, the most learned man of his age, the imperial candidate, had been made patriarch by the Emperor Michael III in place of Ignatius, who had proved too independent. Called in to

act as arbitrator, Nicholas had renewed the claims of superior rank as occupant of the Roman See, and brought about the return of Ignatius. Photius entered into an active polemical controversy in which he attacked the Roman theories of the Church and severely handled its dogmatic (filioque), disciplinary and liturgical characteristics. An Eastern synod was called, which restored Photius and passed a formal act of deposition on Pope Nicholas. But this act was not final, for by a revolution which overthrew Michael the tables were completely turned and Photius was again forced out of the patriarchate. Ignatius took his place, and the acts of the new synod validated Nicholas' decision and formally accepted the Roman primacy. These rapid changes produced no settlement. Though John VIII, some years after Nicholas' death, was willing to bargain his acceptance of Photius as valid patriarch in exchange for the acknowledgment of his jurisdiction over the Bulgarians, who had in the meantime placed themselves under the Constantinopolitan patriarch, his terms were rejected and fresh synodical action (879-880) reversed the concessions made ten years before to Rome. There was a schism again in 881, and when relations were restored between the two sees, the papacy had gone through such vicissitudes and reached so low a level that the effect of this new restoration of harmony was nil, for Bulgaria was lost permanently. Among the northern Slavs the concessions by Rome of a liturgy in their own tongue was withdrawn, and the Mo-

ravian Church, as a result of the Magyar invasions, ceased to exist.

The Church and Feudalism

The ninth century, which had opened so auspicously under the Empire of Charles the Great, drew to its close in an atmosphere of anarchy and chaos. The disintegration of all centralized power was hastened by the constant terror of raids by Northmen and Saracens and by the more systematic invasion of hitherto Christian lands on the part of the hordes of heathen Magyars. The Church shared in the general ruin,—discipline was relaxed, organization fell to pieces, bishoprics, monasteries and churches alienated their landed property to lay landlords, but worse still was the utter demoralization that affected the whole social structure. Barbarous deeds and the grossest forms of self-interest characterized every class of society; bishops treated the property of the Church as their own personal possessions, and in every way stood on the same moral level as their neighbors, the great landed proprietors. Where the royal authority was better preserved, as among Eastern Franks, that is the Germanic portions of what had been the Carolingian Empire, the situation was somewhat better.

In Italy, where the forces of political disintegration were actively at work, nothing can be more perplexing than to try to sum up the religious situation. Southern Italy can be eliminated because it was under the

control of the Constantinopolitan patriarchate. In northern Italy the archbishop of Milan began to take foremost rank as the active head of the Italian episcopate with the civil jurisdiction of a count in Lombardy; further south, in Tuscany, the Church was kept in a dependent position by the territorial lords. Worst of all was the situation of the Church in Rome and its adjoining territory. As imperial authority in the city disappeared with the downfall of the Carolingian Empire, power fell more and more into the hands of the local nobles, the large landed proprietors either in or near the city. The importance of the lay proprietors was enhanced by the need of watchful, effective vigilance against the repeated Saracen raids, which caused such terror that the Basilica of St. Peter and the ground near it was walled in and became what is still known as the Leonine City. After the death of Pope Formosus, as the century closed, the situation at Rome reached an unexampled stage of demoralization. The Roman nobility, and more especially the women members of the aristocratic factions, controlled the elections to the papacy, which became the prize of their paramours and children. This moral collapse affected but did not destroy the constitutional system which had been built up as a support for papal supremacy. Papal legates still appeared at synods; metropolitan jurisdiction was still interfered with; the pallium distributed; special privileges and church property records were still sent to Rome for registration or approval. But there can

be no question that the years into which the Roman regime sunk so low that it well deserves to be called a Pornocracy (896-963), meant an eclipse of the centralized system of church administration for which Nicholas I had worked so hard.

Alfred the Great

While religion on the Continent was in a state of decline tending towards eclipse, the Church in England was, through the genius, good sense and sturdiness of King Alfred (871-901), preserved from the unhappy influences so actively at work in neighboring lands. The Northmen invasions were brought by him to an end, and those who had come into the country in great numbers in north and middle England were allowed to remain on condition of their accepting baptism. In a narrower sphere, Alfred worked out the principles of Charles the Great; learning was renewed, the jurisdiction of the English Church extended over Wales and in the land so long harried by the Danes, and numbers of church buildings were constructed. But the line of development departed from Roman models; for example, the ascetic ideal was no longer popular, the Benedictine rule was neglected, and most of the clergy were married, the result being that parish property was treated as a private possession of the parish priest, and so fell into the hands of his natural heirs and relatives. In Ireland and Scotland the era of the Northmen invasions proved a time of storm and stress. Monasteries and

churches in Scotland fell into the hands of lay proprietors, monastic hermit life died out and there came to take their place groups of clerics (Culdes, Deicolæ) who lived in community, and yet, like the English parish clergy, were married.

Doctrinal Questions

While one can only be surprised that the Carolingian settlement of the Church lasted so short a time, the picture of the ninth century chaos is so striking that one is equally surprised that the effects of the Carolingian renaissance lasted so long. There were many interesting leaders who maintained the good traditions of the humanistic revival of Charles. Hrabanus Maurus, a scholar of Alcuin (d. 856), influenced many disciples, among them Hincmar, (d. 882), Paschasius Radbert, Ratramn. The first vigorously defended in various writings his position in the "metropolitan" controversy, the last two took part in the question of the Presence in the Eucharist. Radbert held, and he was the first to develop technically the thesis that through a miracle in the Lord's Supper after consecration, behind the sensible elements, there is to be found the body of the Incarnate and Ascended Christ. Ratramn objected to the realistic terms in which this miracle was described and confined himself to the assertion that the miracle was of the spiritual order, while fully acknowledging the existence of a reality in the consecrated elements independent of the faith of the believer. Almost

coincident with this eucharistic controversy was a revival of strict Augustinianism under the leadership of the monk Gottschalk, who put Grace in a primary place above Sacraments and Church. This led to his condemnation by the Synod of Quiercy (849), but finally the Synod of Toucy (860) adopted a compromise measure which was satisfactory to Gottschalk's adherents because it connected Grace and the Sacraments, though it failed to be accepted by their leader. Agobard of Lyons (816-840) was indefatigable in attacking heathen practices and all tendencies to a religion of mere mechanism. While all other teachers of this period were under St. Augustine's influence, John the Scot, trained in the Scotch-Irish Church, came into contact with Eastern monks who had taken refuge in this far-away region during the course of the Iconoclastic Controversy. His acquaintance with the methods and sources of Greek culture gave him a commanding position at the court of Charles the Bald (843-877), where, as the head of the royal school, he translated into Latin the works of the Pseudo-Dionysius, the main source of Christian mysticism, and in his own writings on dialectic and in his mystical theology John presented the traditions of Neoplatonism in a Latin garb. He was admired, too, as a master of strange lore and unfamiliar erudition, but he created no permanent school, nor was he able to break the strength of the modified form of Augustinianism which dominated Western thought.

CHAPTER III.

THE CLUNIAC REFORM AND THE HILDEBRANDINE SETTLEMENT

WITH the tenth and eleventh centuries, the Church enters a period of reform. To understand this development it is necessary to sum up in a few generalizations the details already given and the changes introduced in existing conditions. In Church and State, centrifugal movement was an evidence of the self-consciousness of nationalism. What from one point of view was disintegration was simply the expression of Teutonic ideas which, because of the political expansion of the Frankish monarchy, became predominant in Western Christianity. The Greco-Roman traditions of the earlier period of the Church were abandoned, and just as the civil law of the Empire disappeared before the various tribal laws of the Teutons, so the canon law of the Church, buttressed and expanded on Romo-centric principles by the Forged Decretals, could not resist the demand for autonomy both secular and religious. Asceticism lost its hold because the Teutonic peoples believed in marriage and family life. Church property in all its forms suffered, it may be claimed, from the hand of the spoiler; in plain language, all that happened was this: that church property was treated in accordance with Germanic, not Roman law. The master of an

estate on which a church or monastery stood looked upon himself as its owner and controller. The proprietor of the land appointed the parish priest and the abbot and used the church property as a source of income. In the coming reform, we cannot fail to see a movement against the Germanization of the Church in favor of a restoration of the Latin-Roman traditions which, with the new interpretations based on the Forged Decretals, reappear in the Hildebrandine papacy.

The Genesis of the Cluniac Reform

The reform began, not in Rome, but in the Burgundian monastery of Cluny, which after being freed from lay control by Duke William of Aquitaine in 910, was made an autonomous community under papal supervision and so exempted from diocesan jurisdiction. The abbot was elected by the community and it accepted the man designated by his predecessor; so continuity of policy was maintained. The rule was Benedictine, but modified in such a way that the regulations were not strictly ascetic; obedience was the main requirement, and strict attention was paid to the observance of pilgrimages, to devotion to relics, and to belief in miraculous intervention. Frequent communions and the practice of penance were specially emphasized by Cluny; but the revival spread by influence rather than by authority, for it is a mistake to picture the Cluniac monasteries as a centralized system of communities, controlled by the

abbot of the original foundation. The momentum and expansion of the reform were helped by the political restoration under Otto the Great (936-973), who brought together the eastern half of what had been Charles the Great's empire, with considerable additions to the north and northeast, under the strong control of a central executive. To repress the movements of the nobles, always restless under an overlord who made his power felt, Otto allied himself with the great ecclesiastics of his kingdom, who, as opponents of the lay landed proprietors, had the same interests as himself. The relations between Church and State were regulated. The rights of the lay proprietors — in this case, of the king — were expressed in the ceremony of investiture. The bishop or abbot, through the use of some symbol, was admitted into possession of the church property and so expressed his willingness to assume the ordinary feudal dues, including, of course, the obligation of warring in behalf of the overlord. Secular control was also made manifest in the regalian rights by which the king received the income of the property of the see or abbey during a vacancy, and the "spoliation" right by which all the personal property of bishop or abbot reverted to the crown on his death. Candidates for great ecclesiastical positions were selected from the clergy trained about the court; they became the expert servants of the monarch and much of the work of administration and counsel was in their hands. Financially and for warlike purposes they were the

backbone of the monarchy. So national was the Ottonian system of church government that in the tenth and eleventh centuries the term "*summus pontifex*" meant metropolitan, while the words "*concilium generale* or *universale*" were used for a provincial synod.

The military success of Otto gave him the Italian crown in 951, but it was ten years before he set about to rescue the papacy from the ignoble condition into which it had fallen. First of all, allied with John XII, the dissolute young son of a Roman noble, who was ambitious to extend his authority over a large territory, Otto was crowned emperor by his ally, and concession made as to territory, income and ecclesiastical supervision. As emperor, Otto worked for the revival of the Carolingian claims over Rome and soon exercised them, for the young pope was brought to trial and deposed. His successor, Leo VIII (963-5), was nominated by Otto, and the papacy was as subordinate to Otto as any German see. But in Rome itself the emperor's efforts failed to break the power of the local aristocracy, which continued to control papal elections. In northern and central Italy monastic reform was ably championed by Nilus (1005) and Romuald, who re-introduced the community life of groups of hermits (1027).

The Growth of the Reform Movement

In the meantime the influence of Cluny was spreading in France, where it appealed to the strict

religious standards of those who gave their money to monastic foundations. Important in this connection was the introduction of a more careful economic administration in the reformed communities; they made better use of their property and so they could attract a larger number of benefactors. Great abbeys arose modelled after Cluny, and wherever they sprang up, they became loyal adherents of the canonical system contained in the pseudo-Isidorian decretals. Naturally the desire for immunity from diocesan control made all of these communities advocates of a centralized organization resting upon the Roman primacy. In England the reform had found an untiring advocate in Dunstan, Archbishop of Canterbury (955-988), who was most successful in recovering church property from lay occupiers and in restoring the celibacy of the clergy. After the accession of Otto III as emperor (995), Rome itself came under Cluniac influence in the person of Gregory V (996-999), who made use of the Forged Decretals in settling the case of a dispute involving the archbishopric of Rheims. The new French kingdom of the Capetian house (Hugh Capet, 987-996) was largely the creation of the great sees of northern France, and Church and State were there as closely allied as under the Ottos in Germany. When for political reasons Arnulf of Rheims was deprived of his see by the bishops under Capetian jurisdiction, the abbots of the Cluniac monasteries appealed to the celebrated decretals by which jurisdiction in such cases was claimed for the

pope alone. The bishops in vain called attention to the degradation of the Roman See. Gregory V, supported by Hugh Capet's successor, Robert (996-1031), forced the new incumbent of Rheims, Gerbert, the most distinguished scholar of his age, to withdraw and make place for Arnulf. When Gerbert became pope under the name of Sylvester II, he eagerly seconded the aims of his patron, Otto III, who was bent on ruling the empire as Charles the Great had done, and therefore desired to keep the Church under firm control by its central authority. Vigorous resistance was made by the German episcopate when Sylvester tried to make his claim good about a question of jurisdiction over the abbey of Gandersheim. The death of both pope and emperor left the matter undecided. The Roman See again became localized, and the history of the popes who were the creatures of the family of the Crescentii was but a replica of the situation at the close of the ninth century.

The Campaign Against Simony and Clerical Marriage

The new stage of the Cluniac reform is on a larger and more successful scale. Robert, King of France, leaving the episcopate, which showed restlessness under the royal authority, worked in close relation with the abbots of Cluniac monasteries. Among the great vassals of the crown who were practically independent, many became eager supporters of the reform movement. Northern Italy came under the

influence of the movement, and in rapidly expanding Christian Spain the monastic reform was encouraged by Sancho of Navarre, Castile and Arragon (970-1035) and by his son Ferdinand (1035-1056). In Germany the movement was helped by Henry II (1002-1024), who united zeal for strenuous discipline in monasteries with a policy of lay control over their landed possessions. He, however, was a constant friend of Odilo, abbot of Cluny, and made it his object to found new monasteries, nobly endowed, where the Cluniac reformers were placed in control. For a time the current towards reform in Germany moved strictly within the limits of national church ideals; the papacy did not count as a special factor in it. The important change produced by Henry II's influence was the extension of the reform to the secular clergy. Stricter views of discipline became popular, care for the protection of church property was insisted upon, and a vigorous campaign initiated against clerical marriage, a subject closely connected with the disposition of church property when held by a married clergy.

The word simony had come to be used to mean the financial exploitation of church property or religious functions by clerical or lay owners. The legal situation of the Church, its connection with local nobles and with national monarchs opened up many avenues for reproach on this ground. Bishops or abbots were mulcted in large sums on their appointments; this expense, added to the loss of income caused by the

alienation of landed property belonging to the church foundations, suggested the selling of official services at fixed sums. Bishops on their consecration had to pay the metropolitan; the clergy were treated in like manner by their bishop; parishioners were exploited by their parish priest. Clerical marriage, because it was the contradiction of asceticism and also produced a diversion of church income into the hands of private individuals, became along with simony the chief object of attack by the reformers. Where the disintegration caused by feudalism was strongest there the Cluniac party met the greatest obstacles. To overcome the obstruction of the local nobles of Aquitaine against the condemnation of private warfare and feuds, the Synod of Limoges (1031) instituted the "interdict", by which the recalcitrants were threatened with an entire suspension of church functions—no public services, no blessing of the marriage tie, no religious burial of the dead. The movement only attained success, however, when secular authorities were induced to add their help and repress by force the disobedient. In this way, the Truce of God, by which the appeal to self-help was limited to certain days in the week, became a fixed institution in France.

The Champions of Reform at Rome

Before the middle of the eleventh century the propaganda of Cluny had won its way, but its moral ideals were more firmly imprinted than its political and con-

stitutional principles. The self-consciousness of the clergy as a separate class was developed by the enforcement of higher standards of service, but nationalism remained firmly entrenched in the Church. The governmental platform of the Forged Decretals could not be applied so long as the papacy itself was under the control of local Italian landholders. To change the situation in Rome was not easy, though the religious reawakening in Italy generally was advanced by the popularity of Walbert, a disciple of Romuald and the founder of the great hermit community at Vallambrosa. Even more effective was the influence of Peter Damiani, another monk trained under Romuald, who as a writer and speaker made impassioned attacks on simony and proclaimed as the sole cure for all local irregularities the exercise of effective leadership by Rome. But the opportunity for any one private individual bringing about a change at Rome was slight.

A fresh impetus came from Henry III of Germany (1039-1054), who took in hand in 1046 the work of introducing Cluniac measures in Rome itself. Benedict IX, a mere boy, the tool of the local Tusculan faction, had as a rival Pope Sylvester III, who represented another group of Roman nobles. Benedict tired of the conflict and sold his claims in the Roman See to a respected member of the local Roman clergy, afterwards Gregory VI, who, though regarded as the champion of the Cluniac programme in Rome, did not hesitate to procure his elevation by a proceeding

plainly simoniacal. This was in 1045; the German monarch as soon as he appeared in Italy summoned syonds at Sutri and Rome, which deposed all three popes, and at Henry's bidding elected a German bishop to the see. Other German popes came in rapid succession, all Henry's nominees, for his position as patrician of the city and his dignity as emperor gave him a decided voice in these elections. The demands for moral reform were met by these changes, but they did not break up the dependence of the papacy on the civil power. Another step forward was taken when Leo IX became pope in 1048, and stood for Cluniac standards in their widest sense.

It was Leo IX who introduced into Rome the pseudo-Isidorian constitutional theories of the papacy in relation to Church and State, around which centres the subsequent history of the mediæval period. His programme was religious reform, political independence and administrative sovereignty. In Rome itself this meant the delocalization of the city; so we soon find the city clergy overshadowed by the presence of monks from all parts of the Church, summoned there to carry out Cluniac standards. Among them was Hildebrand of Tuscany, a friend of the deposed Gregory VI, who had shared the pope's exile, and whose admiration for the Cluny leaders was well known. The restoration of financial stability was as necessary as moral reform. By making the Church independent the hold upon it of local landlords would be relaxed, especially if the administration of the property of the

see were in outside hands. Leo saw to it that the Roman nobility played no further rôle in administration. These local transformations were accompanied by what might be called a carefully conceived international propaganda. Moral and disciplinary reforms were no longer left to local authorities. The pope himself took the lead in person; he held and presided over synods in northern Italy, Germany, and France; he was seen consecrating new church buildings, distributing relics, granting indulgences. To many laymen, therefore, papal authority, visibly active in the personal presence of the head of Western Christianity, became something more than a name.

In these long journeys of Leo, the local episcopate was brought into connection with the See of Rome, and the bond so constructed was made stronger by the holding of regular yearly Easter synods at Rome, at which bishops of various provinces were present. Different methods were applied in different regions; the pressure of the central authority was more strongly felt in the French kingdom and duchies than in Germany. A synod was called to meet at Rheims in 1049 without any preliminary authorization from king or noble; members against whom there were personal charges or who remained away, were summoned to Rome. But no such independent stand was taken against German nationalism; the Church of Mainz we find protesting effectively against the deposition of one of its deacons by the pope, and Bishop Gebhard of Eichstadt (1052) succeeded, as the champion of

nationalism, in preventing the emperor from giving armed support to the papal scheme for armed intervention in southern Italy. Yet when Gebhard himself became pope as Victor II, no change was made in Roman policy. New territory was handed over to be under papal jurisdiction; papal legates deposed French bishops, and so unselfishly did the head of the empire support the Cluniac standards of church autonomy that Henry III renounced for himself and for his son the right of intervening in papal elections.

The Normans and the Papacy

How much could be and was accomplished by a reforming emperor and a reforming pope, we have just seen. Still there was no guarantee for such coöperation in the future. The presence of Norman adventurers in southern Italy was shrewdly taken advantage of by the papacy as offering a nucleus that might develop into a permanent bulwark for the papacy. They could protect it against interference from the local nobility of Rome, and might prove equally serviceable as a counterpoise against German influence. Beginning with a small group of pilgrims, who on returning from the Holy Land had offered their services against the Saracens in southern Italy and Sicily, the Normans first acquired a small territory between Capua and Naples. Their success attracted other kinsfolk from the north of France. Warring against both Greek and Arab, they were successful against both. By the time of Leo, southern Italy,

previously in Greek hands, was ruled by Norman nobles who accepted the overlordship of the German emperor. The next stage of this Norman Conquest was the taking of Sicily from the Arab emirs, a process begun in 1049 by the capture of Messina. Leo, who by certain territorial concessions made to him by Henry III was tempted to take an active part in the affairs of the small principalities near Naples, soon found himself opposed by the Normans. When an army was raised to force the claims of the Roman See, the papal troops were defeated and the pope himself became a prisoner in the Norman camp (Civitate, 1053). This experience led to a complete reversal of papal policy. Six years after this defeat, Leo's successor, Nicholas II, made a formal treaty with the Normans which acknowledged their conquests and regularized their titles, in return for which Robert Guiscard, the Norman duke of Apulia, Calabria and Sicily, accepted the pope as his feudal overlord and pledged himself to protect the Roman See against its enemies at home and abroad.

Valuable as was the pledge of Norman aid, it might have proved onerous by itself, for it tended to throw the papacy in the hands of one single secular power, a result, as experience had showed, to be dreaded. Safety lay in the ability to play off one state against another. The possibility of pursuing this policy was secured by the rise in Italy at this time of two other political factors besides the Normans, both of which exercised a decisive rôle in the struggle between

papacy and empire. There was the beginning of a democratic rule in the free towns of northern Italy and in Tuscany, a powerful state had arisen under a duke of the house of Lorraine, a well-known opponent of the German imperial family who had married Beatrice, the widow of the last margrave of Tuscany. The growth of autonomous towns in Lombardy was due to the increased importance of trade with the Byzantine east that followed this route to the west. Previously these municipalities had been under episcopal control; now the artisan and mercantile classes asserted themselves. The conflict was racial as well as economic. The bishops, like the nobles, were members of the Germanic feudal aristocracy; the lower clergy alone with the industrial class came from unfree latinized element of the population. All the characteristics of a social revolution were present in the campaign carried on in these Lombard cities against the class interests of the landlords and the higher clergy, i.e. those who possessed or controlled property were opposed by the lower class, who found in the platform of the Cluniac party—no simony, no married clergy—a most convenient watchword in their effort to remove political preponderance. Antagonism to episcopal control and desire for independence made these Lombard towns and the advocates of centralized ecclesiastical power natural allies.

The death of Henry III, succeeded as he was by a youthful heir who did not come of age until 1065, furthered the progress of the Cluniac party. How

assured they were of victory can be seen from a pamphlet against simoniacs published by Cardinal Humbert, who with Hildebrand and Damiani stood at the forefront of the reformers. He proclaimed that investiture must be done away because it was a symbol of the dependence of the Church on the State. In the ownership of its property and of the income proceeding from it, the Church must, he said, be freed from connection with secular rulers, landlords, and even tenants. Ecclesiastics who did not maintain these austere standards were to be deposed and their acts of consecration to be held invalid. It was obvious that such a reform could only be carried in the face of princely and prelatical class interests by making the pope arbiter of cases involving all simoniacal transactions. What is more significant, only those metropolitans were to be appointed to sees who had the previous consent of the pope; if his directions were not carried out the people were to be urged to enforce papal commands against their rulers, civil and ecclesiastical. In this way, the foundations were laid for a system aimed to be a concrete realization of St. Augustine's City of God, nor was there any hesitation in carrying out these principles to their definite conclusion.

Cluniac Aims and Ideals

The reformers saw that church independence spelt church sovereignty concentrated in the pope, who as ruler of the Church was sovereign of the world.

When Gerhard of Florence became pope in 1059, Hildebrand placed on the pontiff's head the imperial crown. Only by a ruler who was the actual overlord of cities and territories could such rights be maintained. Treaties with allied states, feudal or democratic, were not enough. The legends of the Constantinian donation were revived and the return to the Bishop of Rome of his territorial possessions in the Italian peninsula and the neighboring islands was demanded. Along with the imperial crown, Nicholas II also wore the royal crown to indicate his right as an immediate ruler in middle and southern Italy. The activities of these years were, however, not confined to picturesque ceremonial. Measures were passed regulating with great care details of local administration, in order to frustrate any attempt on the part of the local authorities to regain control of papal elections. By the decrees of the Easter synod of 1059, the determining factor in nominating and electing a new pope became the cardinals, i.e. the clergy of the chief parishes of the city along with the bishops of small adjoining sees, the so-called suburbicarian titles. All that was left to the laity of the city, great and small, was the right of ceremonial affirmation. Next year another synod did away with the obligation of the imperial consent before the enthronement of a pope. Such were the measures which gave a constitutional foundation to papal independence.

Centralized autocratic rule was further assured by the sending of legates to act as the pope's official repre-

sentatives at local synods. A cardinal or other high dignitary trained in the centre of Roman administration was selected for this post. Pressure was put upon the occupants of the metropolitan sees to appear personally at Roman local synods. So we find Archbishop Wido of Milan, because of Damiani's clever handling of local politics, glad to sacrifice his claims of independence when the democratic opposition to episcopal control became too strong, and appearing at a Roman synod to receive directions from the pope. Loyalty to the papacy was guaranteed by an oath sworn to by Wido and other metropolitans in which obedience was specifically promised to papal legates, an engagement ratified by personal appearance each year or through deputy at the Roman synod. There was now no obscurity as to the meaning of these various decrees; those who were affected by them proceeded to organize an opposition. Roman nobles, Lombard bishops and the officials of the imperial court in Germany refused to recognize Alexander II as pope, whose election followed the new model, and an anti-pope was set up in his stead. But changes in the regency in Germany, the queen-mother being superseded by a group of episcopal guardians, brought about a change of policy, with the result that the anti-pope was abandoned.

The Cluniac party was successful generally; it forced through with the help of the local Milanese democracy the right of appointment to the see independently of lay consent. Closely allying himself

with the nobility of southern France, Alexander II found a ready support against Philip I, the Capetian king, who was an old-fashioned believer in the exploitation of the Church in lay interest. The local French nobles were easily turned to the pope's scheme for a crusade in Spain against the unbeliever; the partisans of Cluny found there a chance to promote their own propaganda as well as to drive out the Moslem. It is significant that the date of this crusade coincides with the substitution of the Roman for the old West Gothic or Mozarabic liturgy. Though the king of France was apathetic, it made little difference, for the territory actually controlled by him was small. What was more important was to secure the support of the Norman Duke William. He and his duchess were known as ardent supporters of Cluny and its plan for papal reform. Nothing was likely therefore to produce more immediate results than for Alexander to side with William in his claim to the crown of England. The ground seemed prepared here for a great subject Norman kingdom of the north to be as easily secured as the south Italian, now ruled by William's kinsmen. Three papal legates helped William after the conquest to organize, or rather to Normanize, the English Church. But the Conqueror soon showed that though he endowed Cluniac monasteries, he had no intention of ruling his duchy or his newly won kingdom according to the new system of church control discovered by Damiani and Hildebrand. In other places, notably among Bohemians

and Hungarians, the propaganda was more successful; here there was an opportunity to claim these territories as fiefs of the Holy See because they were conquests made from paganism. In Germany, the campaign against metropolitan authority went on systematically.

Hildebrand as Pope

When Hildebrand himself became pope in 1073 with the title of Gregory VII, a strong foundation had been laid theoretically and concretely for papal absolutism. Its representative was prepared to push the whole system to its relentless conclusion. The first great problem was the German Church, governed as it was by national traditions, and confident of imperial support. Gregory first moved diplomatically; he even asked the young emperor Henry IV's consent to his election, but at the same time went quietly along suspending and deposing German bishops. The pope, too, probably hesitated to adopt more extreme measures because the territorial expansion of the Normans in Italy worried him. He was fearful of seeing his capital become a mere enclave in Norman territory. When the investiture decree was extended in 1075 to all German sees, Gregory kept it secret and was prepared to compromise with the emperor. But the pope's opportunity was not long in coming. An attempt of Henry's counsellors to build up a strong territorial bulwark for the royal executive in Saxony, where he could be independent of both bishop and

noble, excited the suspicion of these two classes of magnates. A revolt ensued against the emperor. But the immediate cause of the break between emperor and pope came over the question of filling the See of Milan. When Henry attempted to elevate his candidate, the pope threatened excommunication. Henry replied by a decree from a German synod (Worms, 1070) which deposed the pope. Gregory immediately pronounced the decree of excommunication, suspended the king from his throne and released all his subjects from their oaths of obedience. So began a conflict which shook the German monarchy to its foundations for a period of twenty years.

The issue was no simple one; its social and economic sides were as important as its relations with divergent juristic conceptions of State and Church. The Cluniac papacy allied itself with every element that advocated social change. The conditions in Milan already referred to were symptomatic. Gregory VII undertook in a masterly way to utilize the chaotic and hierarchic administration of a feudalized state with its varied spheres of self-interest for the advantage of a world-wide policy of absolutism. Peoples arrayed against their overlord, the antagonism of the lower class against the propertied class, the fear felt by the small propertied class for the richer landlords, all were to produce supporters for the papacy. One great emotional weapon was the interdict which, when applied, spelt the ruin of social religion. All manner of political and national al-

liances were forged to protect the papal dominion from being overrun by its enemies, but this was only partly successful. By the side of the humiliation of the emperor at Canossa must be placed the invasion of papal territory by the German army, when the pope only escaped capture by being rescued by the Normans.

The New Papal Machinery at Work

All the expedients required to revolutionize a nationally and locally organized ecclesiastical system were applied with the untiring industry of a fanatic. Gregory had the relentless logic of a French Revolutionist. Metropolitan rights were shattered and in their place all that appertained to the supervision of dioceses fell into the hands of the pope. Elections to the diocesan episcopate were superseded by appointment at the pope's hand, and he could translate any bishop from one see to another or depose him. In France, almost all of the metropolitan bishops were either deposed, suspended or banished. Synodical action was under the direction of papal officials; no new canons could be passed without their consent, and to the tribunal of the pope there was an appeal for all so-called *causæ majores*, i.e. matters relating to the episcopate. Plans equally effective were made to destroy the autonomy of the episcopate itself. The pope was given the right to ordain a parish priest for any church, and to exercise supervision over him in the exercise of his parochial charge. It was made

possible also for anyone to appeal against the decision of his bishop to the pope as the final judge.

Various measures were passed to make more effective the freedom of church property of every kind from lay control. Thus were turned over to papal administration the ownership and use of all possessions devoted to religious purposes, and in this way the executive of the church had a source of income, which in the then condition of society was almost unlimited in extent. In addition to these financial resources, it gave to the papacy a claim on the military power, which under feudal tenure was attached to the possessor of all landed estates. The pope was asserted to be the supreme feudal overlord of vast national territories. The emperor himself, it was claimed, was the liegeman of the pope, i.e. he owed his position to the good-will of St. Peter. This personal relation of vassal to overlord was extended from the lands held by the Normans — Apulia, Calabria, and Sicily — to Sardinia, Corsica, the greater part of central Italy, Spain, Hungary, Saxony, England, Denmark, Provence, the Russian principality, Dalmatia, and Bohemia. But there were no limits to the more general claims of sovereign power. As the heir of St. Peter, Gregory declared himself to be the lord of every earthly kingdom, with the right to depose royal and princely potentates throughout the entire Christian world. Only by its regular relation to the Church did any state secure its right to exist, for by itself, without the saving influence of the Church, secular

power was, because of its origin, entirely godless, since it was based on deeds of violence. As precedents for these claims, the pseudo-Isidorian decretals were cited. Since the principles established by them might be indefinitely extended, the pope could affirm his right to initiate new legislation, of the need for which he alone was the supreme judge.

Such was the outline of the magnificent theocracy Gregory VII championed; what he actually accomplished, great as it was, fell short of his ideal. The reform movement in its deepest principles became fixed in the minds of large masses of the population. It was no longer a question whether the clergy should be celibate or not. Monastic standards were accepted; money was no longer paid for consecration and ordination; clergy and monks no more engaged in trade and commerce, one result being that the Cluniac movement was largely responsible for the financial activities of the Jews. In public worship, the acceptance of Gregory's centralized rule led to the disappearance of local liturgical uses, all of which were from now on overshadowed by the ritual of the local Roman Church. Politically, the conflict with the State failed to secure the victory of the papal programme. In many cases the constant pressure from the central ecclesiastical power produced a distinct reaction. By the time of Henry V, i.e. at the end of the eleventh century, even the use of the interdict failed to produce its ordinary effect.

The Concordat of Worms

As an engine for ordering the whole of society along theocratic lines, the Hildebrandine programme was admirably conceived, yet it failed where its creator meant it to succeed. Henry V, commonplace as he was, was capable of stubborn and prolonged resistance, and William the Conqueror without any appeal to arms defeated the Hildebrandine scheme for the reorganization of the Church of England. He allowed Lanfranc, the Archbishop of Canterbury, to introduce disciplinary reforms, but he preserved the right of investiture over abbeys and bishoprics, refused to exempt the clergy from the jurisdiction of the secular courts, collected tithes from and imposed feudal dues on ecclesiastical property, forbade appeals to Rome, retained for the Crown the right of recognizing the pope, and without the king's consent no excommunication of crown vassals was permitted. William II pursued with irritating crudeness the same ecclesiastical policy. Anselm, who followed Lanfranc (1089), was fully in sympathy with the Hidebrandine standards, and seeing his opportunity at the death of William II, refused to take the oath to his successor, Henry I. This led to a long conflict over the investiture question in which the higher clergy of the land ranged themselves with the king. When the matter was finally arranged in 1106, the substantial gains were all on the side of the monarchy. The king, indeed, con-

sented to give up all the symbols of investiture (the ring and staff) and the "regalian rights", but he continued to be the legal owner of church property, kept the nomination of bishops and abbots in his hands, was the only authority by which the tenure of church land could be validated, and exacted from the clergy the oath of personal loyalty. No communications were allowed with Rome except by royal warrant, and a like condition was imposed upon the appearance of papal legates in England.

In German lands, the settlement of the investiture conflict took longer. At one time (Concordat of Sutri) it was proposed that the Church should be made dependent on the voluntary contributions of the faithful and on the tithe system, in return for the concession by the secular power of all rights of investiture and election to ecclesiastical office. This proposal was rejected by the German clergy. Their national leanings and the high-handed conduct of the legates who frequently took no notice of instructions from Rome, brought about a compromise between Calixtus II and Henry V at Worms in 1122. It followed virtually the lines of the arrangement made previously with the English monarchy, but modified according to the relation of the emperor to the particular territories over which he exercised his sovereignty. The secular and ecclesiastical factors in investiture were carefully distinguished, i.e. the bishop's functions as the controller of church lands were kept distinct from his pastoral functions as head of a

diocese. But as the act of royal investiture had to precede the religious ceremony, the king had a practical veto on any candidate. A significant clause appeared by which the consecrating authority and the decision in case of doubtful elections were left to the metropolitan of the province. In Italy and Burgundy, where imperial overlordship was more vague, the smaller political units, cities, courts or local magnates came into ownership of the church property belonging to episcopal sees. Sometimes it was invested in the particular cathedral itself. In southern Italy, the Norman princes maintained even in the face of papal protests the same rights over the Church as their kinsmen in England. In France, though outside the imperial jurisdiction, the arrangement indicated above was adopted in all its essential features.

The Concordat contained no references to the larger questions of church polity; no recognition of the broader theocratic claims of the papal system was asked for or suggested. What this arrangement did, however, was to include a clause leaving the pope as sovereign of the ancient Roman patrimony, i.e. the territory extending along the coast from Monalto to Terracina, and in the interior from Aquapendenti to Ceperano. With the recognition of this sovereignty was eliminated all question of investiture of churches and sees within these limits, not excepting the papal see itself, for elevation to which imperial consent was no longer required. One of the results of the Concordat was to distinguish between church build-

ings and church property, the landed estates of sees remaining subject to the conditions of the feudal law of landholding. Small churches and abbeys were not included, because some being voluntarily alienated by their lay owners to the church authorities, placed themselves under papal protection and paid a small tax to the pope. But for the vast majority the rights of the lay proprietor were maintained; he received a portion of the income derived from the property, while the church building and the religious functions connected with it were conferred upon a particular cleric whom the lay owner named. So arose the rights of presentation and patronage which are still a familiar feature of church life in England at the present day.

In the Hildebrandine church system, with its complicated mass of details, it is not always easy to see the wood for the trees, nor to distinguish how far the reforming movement succeeded. One thing is certain, it left in western Europe two conflicting systems face to face, each with a specific system of law and each presenting a different type of political theory. There is no question that the papacy, beside the advantage it had from its representative functions, as the incarnation of religious institutionalism, won support because it took care to make its position intelligible. While the various national states had no code of laws, Rome collected its legal documents, genuine and forged, and made this collection the basis of legal training.

Missionary Expansion

The advance of the Cluniac reform, followed immediately by the propaganda for the Hildebrandine papal rule, occupies for many years the central field in church history. But the internal movements of the Church should not obscure the importance of missionary expansion during this period. In the tenth century, the Slavic tribes, who at this time extended as far west as Magdeburg, were brought to accept Christianity. Wherever German arms were successful, one can trace the foundation of new episcopal foundations. The See of Posen was founded in 966, and not much later we find a bishopric established in Prague, as the result of the victories of Otto II, and in Moravia, both treated as suffragans of the Archbishop of Mainz. The Hungarians, too, after they had been defeated by German armies and forced to abandon their nomadic existence, were, under both Byzantine and German influences, brought to profess Christianity. For work among the Scandinavian peoples, Hamburg became the chief point of departure. Harold, the "blue-toothed", was baptized in 965, which led to the baptism *en masse* of his people. But there was soon a pagan reaction, encouraged doubtless by objection to German influence, and helped by the lack of interest taken by Otto III in matters affecting only his German dominions.

When the German mission suffered an eclipse, the conversion of Denmark was taken up from England,

where by the fortunes of war, Danish monarchs were established (1016) after the massacre of the Danes living in England, by Ethelred II. Canute (1014-1035) undertook to combine the church organization of both his continental and his insular kingdom. Canute was loyally supported by the clergy of the English Church, who saw in him the champion of Christianity against paganism. For a time it seemed as if Denmark would be controlled by English missionaries, but this influence was evanescent because of the persevering and finally successful efforts of the Archbishop of Hamburg to retain his metropolitan jurisdiction over the Danish mission. English clergy also penetrated into Norway, where, through the favor shown by King Olaf and his intervention in behalf of the new faith, the population were converted, a transformation which affected the Scandinavian islands of the north Atlantic. In Sweden, under the auspices of Anskar, a bishop of Hamburg in the Carolingian period, missionary work had begun, but only feebly and with no enduring result. The systematic expansion of the Church was delayed until the time of King Olaf, who was baptized by English missionaries in 1008. But when the first bishopric was founded, it was placed under the jurisdiction of Hamburg. The connection between this see and the Scandinavian kingdoms was made more effective by Adalbert, the Archbishop of Hamburg-Bremen, in the middle of the eleventh century, a man gifted with great organizing power and thoroughly in sympathy

with the Cluniac reform. Bremen became the religious capital of the northern world, and for a while Adalbert contemplated making his see a patriarchal chair. He finally, however, had himself recognized as papal vicar over a territory which extended from Greenland to Finland (1053). Under the tribal conditions of the Scandinavian peoples, an interesting type of national church arose with a popular organization. The churches were built by the king, by committees, or by individuals, and, in accordance with Germanic law, were owned by them. Both the bishop and priest were appointed by the king or community. The support of the clergy came from lands appropriated for that purpose and a primitive form of taxation and fees was introduced. There was none of the feudalization of the Church common in southern countries; monasticism, too, made little impression, and grew very slowly.

Growth of the Oriental Church

With this list of remarkable achievements in this age of Western Christendom, may be paralleled as coincident with it chronologically the expansion northward of Greek-Christian missions brought about by the marriage of the Russian prince Wladimir in 988 with a member of the Byzantine imperial family. In Russian domains the Church was organized according to Greek standards, with the metropolitan of Kiev subordinate to the Constantinopolitan patriarchate. The Slavic scriptures were introduced and also the

liturgy which has been before mentioned in connection with the work of Cyril and Methodius. In general, the relations with the Western Church became more strained with the growth of the Cluniac movement. We know, for example, that a leading Cluniac champion, William of Dijon, prevented the acknowledgement of the title "ecumenical patriarch" claimed by the occupant of the See of Constantinople. On the other hand, Michael Celularius, Patriarch of Constantinople in the time of Leo IX, a bitter opponent of all customs and doctrines of the Western Church, seemed to have been partly responsible for a violent diatribe written by Leo of Achrida, the metropolitan of Bulgaria, against Roman claims and western traditions, which was sent to one of the bishops in the Byzantine portion of southern Italy. This work having become known to Leo IX, was answered by him, with the same spirit in which it had been composed, in a document sent directly to Michael. This discussion happened to reach a climax when Leo was organizing his expedition against the Normans. With the purpose of interesting the eastern emperor in the scheme, he sent two agents to Constantinople, one of whom was Cardinal Humbert, a convinced and strenuous supporter of the Cluniac party. Owing to the overbearing behavior of the papal emissaries and the anti-Roman prejudices of Michael the patriarch, the project of an alliance between pope and emperor was abandoned. Finally a bull of excommunication directed against the patri-

arch was placed on the high altar of Sancta Sophia on July 16, 1054, and so began the permanent separation of these two ancient communions of the Christian Church. Later, events connected with the crusades only intensified the mutual antagonism.

The First Crusade

The immediate cause of the strange outburst of religious enthusiasm which stirred large bodies of western warriors to undertake the conquest of Palestine, was due to the rapid rise in the East of the Seljukian Turks. In the years following the opening of the eleventh century, they had mastered the Arabian Empire and rapidly organized their own sultanate, soon to become the chief Moslem power. Much of their territorial expansion was made at the expense of the Byzantine Empire. By the close of the century the Greek possessions were confined to the coast line of Asia Minor. Palestine, which for centuries had been in the hands of the Arabs, now that it was controlled by the more fanatical Turks, was no longer accessible to pilgrims from the West. The desire to rescue the sacred sites of Christian history was accentuated by the religious revival due to Cluniac teaching. Just as potent were the commercial ambitions of towns such as Genoa and Pisa, which saw a chance of lucrative profit if they could acquire the eastern sea coast cities of the Mediterranean in Syria. Another factor was the growth of Norman power, which, after being extended over the island of Sicily,

suggested to its rulers the possibility of absorbing the Byzantine Empire. Robert Guiscard planned the conquest of Constantinople, but the scheme was never carried out owing to his death (1085). As the Seljuks became more threatening the eastern emperor asked the stronger western states to help him keep the Moslems in check. To Gregory VII the scheme of eastern expansion was especially attractive, for it meant increased prestige to the Roman See and most probably papal control of the great eastern patriarchate.

The actual development of this plan was not, however, taken up until the pontificate of Urban II, who a few years after Gregory's death proclaimed at the Synod of Clermont (1095) the need for united action on the part of western Europe to rescue from the hands of the Moslem the holy places of Palestine. The response was immediate; warriors from Lorraine, from the various countries ruled over by Norman princes, and representatives from the great French feudal lords, made up the crusading host. While the Greeks retook numbers of important places in Asia Minor, the crusaders proper, using the land routes over countries regained by the Greeks, penetrated into Syria, captured Antioch and then Jerusalem (July, 1099). When the crusaders proceeded to erect states in Syria organized according to the feudal models of the West, Roman ecclesiastics hastened to establish churches and sees within the limits of the crusaders' conquests which were placed under the

jurisdiction of the Roman See, and followed in all respects Western usages. No attempt was made to conciliate the already existing Eastern Christians; accordingly, both ecclesiastically and civilly, the crusading states remained artificial creations without any basis of permanence.

Doctrinal Development

The opening up of the Orient to direct intercourse with the West led to the expansion of culture as well as to the growth of commerce, for with all the activity produced by the propaganda of the Hildebrandine papacy much had been left to do in advancing the intellectual life of Western Christendom. It is true that there were in north Italy schools, not only frequented but taught by laymen, which prepared for secular careers. In France the intellectual movement centred around Fulbert of Chartres (d. 1029), whose pupil, Berengar, famous as the head of the cathedral school of Tours, drew there many disciples, among them the members of great feudal families. Berengar, besides being the reviver of both classic and patristic traditions, used as a test of right faith the employment of dialectic, and justified the use of reason in theological speculation. His supremacy as a teacher soon became challenged when men trained in the frequented schools of north Italian cities migrated elsewhere to become professional teachers. Among them was Lanfranc of Paris, who after studying dialectic and law there, proceeded to found a

school of secular learning in Normandy (1039). Won over, afterwards, to Cluniac monasticism, he entered the monastery of Bec and applied his training to the support of the currently taught doctrinal standpoint of the Western Church. With Lanfranc may be said to have originated the juristic method of handling church doctrines, and he became the master of such acute traditionalists as Anselm of Canterbury and Ivo of Chartres. The two schools could hardly continue near at hand without a conflict. Berengar's views on the Eucharist were attacked by Lanfranc and afterwards denounced at Rome as inconsistent with the conception of a change in substance after consecration. Gregory VII, though personally friendly to Berengar, finally yielded to pressure from a French synod and demanded a retraction.

This controversy was but one indication of an intellectual and cultural revival which soon placed France at the head of western Europe in all that concerned literary expression and artistic feeling. The latinity of the twelfth century, as developed in France, was extremely good, and there was also creative power shown in the poetic work of troubadours and by those who wrote Latin verse. Specially important, also, was the influence of the various French cathedral schools on the systematic development of canon law. The extent of the new influences that came over society, may be measured by the growth of the new administrative ideals for his well-regulated kingdom encouraged by the Capetian monarch, Louis VI, by the rise

of communes, by the origination of the guild system, which revealed the aim of the middle and working classes to take the first place in the management of the local community. In this social evolution the actual coöperation of the Church cannot be accurately determined. In some places the middle classes found in the Church a valuable ally against the large landed proprietor and the local nobility. In others, notably in France, the communal rights were opposed by bishops and abbots, with the result that the inhabitants of the towns came to regard the monarchs as their natural ally against the claims of ecclesiastical lords.

St. Bernard and Monasticism

In spite of the Hildebrandine exaltation of theocratic principles and the transference of these axioms into the administrative machinery of the Church, the work of carrying on the reform movement begun at Cluny in the twelfth century did not devolve upon the papacy but was directed by individual champions, backed by no high social position. Chief among these leaders was St. Bernard of Clairvaux, who proved himself stronger than any ecclesiastical institution, and by sheer moral force guided civil rulers, even overshadowing, by his personal influencee, the papacy itself. Born in 1091 of a noble family in the neighborhood of Dijon, Bernard by his devotion to monastic ideals represents their extension to all the interests of his day. No detail of church life escaped his view—

he was a preacher, a politician and a theological disputant. He organized a new crusade, but, in relation to the papacy, he took up the rôle of Cato the Censor in exposing its official abuses, criticized its secularized machinery and imposed upon the Curia his conceptions of law and government. To everyone and to every class he applied the touchstone of an austere system of morality, and there was no subject which he did not discuss authoritatively. As a monastic reformer, Bernard saw the danger of material prosperity. The Cluniac monasteries had been too popular. They suffered from the deterioration caused by the gifts of property made by wealthy patrons.

The reaction against the over-lax rulers of Cluny was started first by Robert of Champagne, the founder of the abbey of Citaux, where he introduced a community which practised the hermit life. Real vigor was brought into the movement when Bernard and a few followers joined it in 1112 and founded the abbey of Clairvaux to serve as a model of strict monastic discipline. The principles of the order were a combination of severe ascetic practices with the pursuit of manual labor in gardening, cattle raising and other kinds of farm work. Literary study was discouraged; to make this career a reality, uncultivated and wild neighborhoods were selected as sites for Cistercian monasteries. This reform was only partial, for many of the clergy of cathedral churches, induced by the privileged position they enjoyed, continued to live the life of secular landlords.

Treating the property of the Church as if they were the actual owners, and dwelling with their concubines and children, their behavior, when measures of restraint were attempted, became a scandal to those of stricter views.

Attempts were made to bring these irregular communities under a fixed monastic rule, Cluny sometimes being taken as a model, e.g. by Hugo St. Victor (c.d. 1141), but the most successful guide to reform was found in Norbert of Xanten (d. 1134), who took for his collegiate commuinties the rule of the Cistercians. As his first establishment was made at Premontre, near Laon, the new order bore the name of Premonstratensians. Regularity in the choir offices, ascetic practices, preaching, were specifically imposed as duties by the new rule. Unlike the Cistercians, scholarly pursuits were encouraged; but both these new orders adopted the custom of having a special class of lay brothers, monastic helots, who did manual labor but were not full members of the community (an institution, by the way, established for the first time under Cluniac rule). As contrasted with Cluny, the Cistercian monasteries represented an ecclesiastical aristocracy; each abbot was supreme over his own monks; but all the Cistercian houses were bound together in a kind of confederation as they were spread over many countries. This system gave them a strong international position; the general chapter of the order served as a community congress to work out and apply a common policy. Both the Cistercians and the followers of

Norbert were rigidly opposed to lay control of any kind. They were not even subject to ordinary ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and by standing together they secured an unusual degree of autonomy.

None of the property belonging to the community could be leased; all land was worked directly by members of the community. Coming into possession as they did of many benefactions and attracting into their membership people of all conditions of life, they controlled a large and intelligent labor force. They were able also to direct it in a way that has only been achieved in our day by the great captains of industry. Economically, these monasteries were great productive centres, where improved methods of cultivation were applied as the result of technical experience in many lands. They took the place, also, of the modern agricultural or technical school in promoting improvements in tillage and in subsidiary handicrafts. In fact, from no source were greater contributions made to the financial and economic stability of the Mediæval Church.

Beginnings of Scholasticism

While one is impressed by the wide appeal made by the new monastic orders because of the field opened in them for the development of individual capacity, it must not be supposed that a monastic career was regarded as the sole occupation for those who did not care for the rough life of warfare or who desired to escape from the narrower interests of the trader and

merchant. France, as we have seen, was the centre of a revival of learning which soon passed beyond the limits of the schools presided over by either Lanfranc or Berengar. There was an opportunity for teachers and students; and the privilege of the chair was open to laymen as well as to the clergy. By one of those paradoxes, seen so often in the mediæval church, the teacher under this system of absolutism had imposed upon him very few restrictions of any kind; there was no direct supervision on the part of the superior ecclesiastical authorities, and the students themselves were allowed a large measure of liberty. Different directions in method and in thought were the natural outcome of this free atmosphere.

Pure intellectualism was the mark of the school of Anselm; reason by a series of necessary deductions could evolve the whole faith from a few premises. In the central point of his theological thought stood the theory of redemption with all its ethical and theological implications. So far as his age was concerned, Anselm's influence was largely that of a master dialectician. This was the study to which most minds turned with greatest enthusiasm. The common ground of such training were the logical works of Aristotle, first read in the translation of Boëthius. That there was no slavish reproduction of ancient models may be seen from the work of Roscelin of Compiegne (d. 1119) who, as founder of Nominalism, denied real existence to all concepts that were not individual things; this position caused him to

attack the realistic principle involved in the doctrine of the Trinity, and his criticism brought him under the animadversion of Anselm, who spoke of him as the heretic of dialectic and procured his formal condemnation by a church synod (Soissons 1096).

Realism, because of the venerable names associated with it in Christian antiquity, reigned practically supreme until the time of Peter Abelard, who by his talents as a teacher and by his vigor of thought clarified many ethical and religious problems con tained in the traditional teaching of the Church. As a critic, he pointed out that the Bible and the conciliar decrees were the sole valid sources for discovering the mind of the Church. In all spheres, scientific principles, he argued, should be employed, because of the unique supremacy of man's reason. But he did not solely concern himself with the reconstruction of dogma. Realism itself he opposed on the ground that it coincided with Pantheism. His speculations on the theory of knowledge led him to adopt a position which is technically known as Conceptualism. According to this doctrine, universals or general terms have no reality, but they do indicate the common properties that are in the particular members of a class. By his epistemological doctrine, Abelard sought to protect the transcendence and the personality of God, the moral purposefulness of His acts, and also was able to prevent that identification of the world with the absolute which appears the necessary corollary of realism.

In Christological speculation, the work of Abelard and of the other anti-realists who were his contemporaries (Gilbert de la Porrée, 1141, Ruprecht von Deutz d. 1135), led to a denial of the traditional explanation of the incarnation, accepted since the time of St. Cyril, and tended to the position of Adoptionism — the view, that is, which emphasizes the human element in Christ. It was this tendency in Abelard which, added to the weaknesses of his personal character, stirred up various opponents to his teaching who found a strong champion in Bernard. His trinitarian position was also challenged, yet despite these attacks, his influence on the development of theological thought survived them. His enemies were not strong enough to keep the presentation of dogmatic study within the accepted traditional lines. His method continued to be a model, especially as shown in his famous work *Sic et Non*. The arrangement here used of giving authorities for and against certain formulated statements became the norm for the treatment of theological discussions. There was due to him, too, the systematic handling of church dogma as a whole, seen in his attempt to harmonize all separate questions as the necessary parts of a complete whole. There is a close connection between his work and that of Peter Lombard, with whom begins the succession of regular scholastic teachers. With less appeal to formal reasoning the writings of Bernard and the school of St. Victor were a product of the pure monastic temper, that aimed at individual perfection

through ascetic training or mystical contemplation. In both these developments, emphasis was laid upon the personal relation of the soul to Christ, presented either as the object of pure adoration or as the embodiment in a transcendent form of the redeeming love called forth and appropriated by the conviction of human sinfulness.

The Cluniac Reform and Popular Religion

Popularly, the vigor of the religious reawakening showed itself in the treatment of those who had violated the moral precepts of the Church. There still prevailed the distinction between public and private penance; those who were guilty of grave offences had to make public confession at the beginning of Lent and receive in the cathedral church of the diocese certain penitential obligations (alms, fasting, pilgrimages, shaving the hair, walking barefoot and the like). Private penance was a matter which concerned alone the individual penitent and the parish priest. The only changes made were in the regularizing of the compensatory acts in such a way that the penalties should not be subject to the caprice of the priest who heard the confession. In the eleventh and twelfth centuries, there is a noticeable tendency to diminish the severity of the penitential system. Those who observed the "peace of God" or who took part in the crusades were given the privilege of receiving formal absolution without waiting for the ordinary interval to pass between the confession of their faults and their

restoration to full communion. So arose the custom of indulgences, which signified in reality that those in authority could impose on the penitent shorter and more merciful forms of satisfaction than those prescribed in the customary penitential manuals.

Another evidence of popular sympathy with the religious revival was the extension of preaching, a practice which seems to have been the product of the reform monastic movement mentioned in connection with the name of St. Norbert of Xanten. Preaching was not confined to church buildings; in streets and in public places, crowds were brought together to listen to the impassioned words of the preacher whose theme was an exhortation to repentance and emphasized the obligation of keeping the peace and according forgiveness to enemies. No restrictions were at first placed on the preaching of laymen; but apparently the opportunity offered for irresponsible persons to acquire dangerous influence over their hearers, or even to enrich themselves, led to the introduction of the rule that no one could preach without securing first the permission of the bishop.

How strongly the coöperation of the laity was sought for and secured can be seen in the number of confraternities of a philanthropic or doctrinal character founded for mutual aid. These organizations appear to have originated in England and to have been first introduced on the continent by St. Boniface. The members were the clergy of a particular locality, or province, then laymen who had by bene-

factions contributed to their success were admitted to their ranks. The religious revival stimulated these confraternities into renewed life and they became a characteristic feature of mediæval society. Sometime in the twelfth century independent lay organizations originated, their appearance coinciding with the industrial advance of northern Italy and France, which tended generally to the development of corporate ties between those who came to feel the social influence of identical interests. These groups, oftentime closely related to the local government of their community or to the industrial guilds, shared in common worship in a common building before a common altar. They took upon themselves certain religious exercises or united to perform philanthropic acts, such as care of the sick and poor, the breaking up of bands of criminals, the building and upkeep of bridges. In all such cases the religious sanction contributed powerfully to create spheres of social energy which could not be directly influenced by monasticism.

Heretical Sects

Despite all this complexity of administration, the changing conditions of western Europe could not be entirely guided by the Church. The spread of city life, the rise of an artisan class, put a severe strain upon the methods of religious propaganda used by the Church with its graded hierarchical divisions, admirably fitted to handle the problems of an agri-

cultural community. The aspirations of the middle class seemed less well understood, for they turned in considerable numbers for guidance to a strange religious sect, the Kathari, who were strong in North Italy and France. Taking their origin from the remnants of Marcionites and Priscillianists found on the eastern frontier of the Byzantine Empire, and also from the Euchites, a community based on emotional asceticism that existed in Syria and eastern Asia Minor, the Kathari first appear as an independent religious organization among the Bulgarians under the name of Bogomils, i.e. friends of God. Their teaching penetrated westward along the ordinary trade routes through the Slavic dealers in eastern wares. Their success in making converts may be ascribed to their appearance at a time when the efficiency of the Church was at a low ebb, i.e. prior to the period of the Cluniac reform, at the end of the tenth and beginning of the eleventh century. They won their way among all clases of society but especially among the artisans and laborers. Some of their success must be ascribed to the ability of their leaders as popular preachers.

In organization, the Kathari, like the old Manichæans, had a hierarchical class of 'perfecti', who received the special sacrament of the laying on of hands, practised an ascetic life, and could forgive sins and secure for the initiated future bliss. Both women and men belonged to this class and were the leaders in active propaganda. Doctrinally, the

teaching was dualistic — the kingdom of light and darkness — the realm of matter and spirit; only by practices of strict asceticism could the ties of the material world be broken. Those who were "perfected" had the obligation of winning converts, were expected to guide them spiritually and prepare them for "a good death." But reception into this exclusive circle was alone regarded as a guaranty of entrance into heaven. The antagonism of the Kathari to the Church was carried to a radical extreme; church sacraments were held invalid, the Old Testament was rejected, and all the forms of religious worship held in abhorrence. It must be remembered, however, that since many of the adherents of Katharism were not complete initiates, this radical position was not often held. What attracted converts was probably the appeal to a simple life and the contrast offered by the Kathari missionaries to the worldliness, ostentation, crudeness, and brutality of the official clergy.

The attention of the ecclesiastical authorities was first called to the propaganda of the Kathari in Spain and in Sardinia, and later in France and Italy, where strong measures were used against them early in the eleventh century. But the attitude of the Church was by no means uniform, because among the Germanic people the ancient laws of the Christian Roman Empire against heretics had never been applied. There had been no heretical movements *en masse*; individuals alone had departed from the orthodox doctrine; excommunication, deposition, enclosure in

a monastery, had been the extreme penalties, for the heterodox had usually been members of the clerical order. The spread of Katharist doctrine created, therefore, a considerable problem, and in northern and southern Europe we find different methods of meeting it.

Among the Teutonic peoples heresy was placed in the same category as the practice of magic and the preparation of poisonous drugs. Such were adjudged heinous crimes and under the old tribal law had been punished by burning. This was the popular point of view, but its drastic precepts were opposed by prelates like Bishop Wazo of Luettich and also by Gregory VII. It was only by degrees that the Church became the advocate of extreme measures. At the Synod of Rheims in 1157, a proposal was made that the secular power should use the death penalty against heretics. In the southern zone, a milder atmosphere prevailed; it is true a few leaders perished, but general toleration lasted from 1034 for a period of a century and a half. In southern France there first appeared a desire for strenuous measures on the ground that heresy, as a crime, should be punishable by imprisonment, alienation of property and expatriation.

Canon Law and Curial Administration

With the close of the struggle over investiture, the golden age of the papacy begins, a period comparable to those years of peace in the history of Rome inaugurated by the recognition of the principate, after the

stormy epoch of dictatorship and civil war. The full headship of the pope was accepted and in his hands lay the direction of the whole and all its parts. The episcopate counted for little. Synods, it is true, met and were largely attended, but to the episcopate were now assigned the functions given the people in the Homeric assembly. The bishops were decorative but not necessary factors in these imposing gatherings. The full codification of church law presented a far stronger basis for papal autocracy than synodical action, and so we find Gratian in his collection called the *Decretum* or the Concordance of Discordant Canons (about 1124), giving papal decretals the same validity as the decisions of the general councils. The only limitation placed by Gratian's code on papal authority was the law of nature and God, a most elastic principle, for the arbiter of this transcendental law was the pope himself. At first Gratian's work had only the authority of his name as an individual teacher; later, when it was used as a textbook in schools of canonical and theological learning, it replaced all other collections. His sources are brought together with no critical ability whatever, documents true and false standing side by side. Even more serious are the mistakes due to the glosses and deductions made by Gratian in commenting on his texts; yet they came also to be regarded as authoritative, and many of the features peculiar to papal absolutism were due to arguments elaborated by Gratian himself.

As important in the life of the Western Church as papal canon law was the evolution of papal administration. Local influences no longer had weight; the nobility of Rome had finally lost all power and in their place now stood the papal Curia or Court with members drawn from all nationalities. In their hands was concentrated the direction of a most complicated system of government — executive, legislative, and judicial. Appeals covering cases of discipline were carried to Rome from all portions of the Church. Since the ninth century grave offences had in an unsystematic way been left to be dealt with by the pope, and frequently the offenders themselves had been sent to Rome in order to have the limit of their period of excommunication there decided by the highest authority. Under the Cluniac reform this custom was more frequently put into practice, as the power of the diocesan bishop became gradually weaker. In course of time questions regarding certain sins were specifically reserved for papal decision. Closely connected with this practice was the exercise of the right of dispensation under which the pope in special instances suspended the operation of a definite church law in the case of a particular individual. Further restrictions on local diocesan authority are seen in the extension of "reservations", i.e. the appointment by papal authority alone of the incumbents to positions which had previously been in the gift of the bishop of the diocese.

This course of development was found to be an ef-

fective way of supplying the growing financial needs of papal administration. It was probably due to the financial experience of Hildebrand that the traditional plan of supporting the Roman See by patrimonial possessions in landed estates, directly worked by hired agents, was replaced by a system of money payments, taxes and fees. In this respect the papal government was far in advance of most secular kingdoms. Monasteries under special papal protection, as well as countries and individuals bound to the papacy by feudal ties, paid for the privileges in money contributions, and one of the most unique resources of the papal treasury was the Peter's Pence, a custom that had originated in England in the eighth century as an obligatory contribution, collected to support a hospice in Rome to house the Saxon pilgrims; this sum, after being regulated at a fixed amount annually, was finally diverted into the papal exchequer.

The financial and legal duties of the papal government of the Church required a definite training; something, therefore, resembling the civil service of the modern state came into existence. The officials employed in it were not only given positions in Rome itself, but were also, under the system of "reservations" mentioned above, provided with lucrative posts in other countries. The natural result of growth in the business and administrative sphere of papal rule led to the production of the curial official, who was more distinguished for shrewdness and diplomacy than for his devotion to Christian standards of con-

duct. It was this deterioration in the official class around the pope which called from St. Bernard, a devoted adherent of the papal system, strong words of reproof in his tract "On Consideration" — a personal appeal to Pope Eugenius to set his household in order.

Aided by a trained bureaucracy which gave to the papal system continuity of policy, the curial cause was substantially helped also by groups of papal partisans who were particularly active when organized as new monastic orders. The Cistercians especially were singled out for valuable privileges. Citeaux, like Cluny, had originally been under diocesan supervision, but later on it became entirely exempted, when it began to be seen what use might be made of an international monastic party pledged to act everywhere as partisans of the Roman See.

CHAPTER IV.

THE HILDEBRANDINE PAPACY AT WORK

NOW that the machinery of the Hildebrandine papacy has been traced in outline, it is interesting to see this remarkable creation at work in the period of its greatest success, i.e. from the middle of the twelfth to the third quarter of the following century, by which time the traditional antagonist of the papal regime, the imperial power of the Germans, had been overcome in a mighty contest, which showed the efficiency of Hildebrand's programme. The issue of this long struggle was not always clearly foreshadowed and the end was not reached until after a closely connected series of events, all of which pointed to papal supremacy. There were decided ebbs of the tide, periods, that is, in which old questions apparently long since settled were again burning points in the relations between State and Church.

Arnold of Brescia

Cases of local unrest in Rome itself frequently brought the papacy into danger, and more than once there were two claimants to the papal dignity. On one occasion the pope himself had to take refuge in France when the commonalty of Rome asserted for itself the same rights as those which were so effectively being used in other Italian cities.

This picturesque movement was championed by Arnold of Brescia, a pupil of Abelard, and a monk who held that the sole cure for the progressive deterioration of the Church, due to world politics and to world business, was abstention from ownership of property. The clergy were to live by the free-will offerings of the faithful. On these grounds he attacked the exercise of episcopal jurisdiction in his own city. Priests who refused to accept these austere standards were to be rejected as unworthy, and the sacraments administered by them held invalid. Arnold's teaching may be regarded as an instance of the influence of the Kathari, but after all they are but easy deduction from the principles of the Cluniac movements. By a decree of the Lateran Council of 1139, Arnold was banished from Italy, and then by St. Bernard's influence, who dreaded his attacks on the papal system, driven from city to city until he found a refuge in Rome, where he placed himself at the head of the local democratic movement which had gained new strength on account of the disputed election to the papal chair. Pope Eugenius' desire to make use of the actual political situation in Germany and in southern Italy to advance his cause, enabled Arnold to point to him as an example of the degradation caused by the cultivation of secular ambitions on the part of the head of the Church. Arnold failed because the Emperor Frederick I had no interest in sustaining a champion of local liberties in Rome.

The Papacy and Nationalism

Such criticism as that of Arnold was not without justification, because the whole attention of the Curia was concentrated on making the best use of political conditions in western Europe. It tried to gain definite advantages wherever the arrangement made by the Concordat of Worms could be claimed to be violated. The wide play of clerical influence may be seen in the history of England during this period. In the matter of the disputed succession between Matilda and Stephen, the episcopate claimed to act as arbiters. The jurisdiction of the Roman See was extended so broadly that almost any case might be appealed from the King's courts. It was due also to clerical influence that Stephen's son was not appointed as his successor to the throne.

On the larger continental scale the contest between Church and State was waged between the Hohenstaufen emperor, Frederick I, and the papacy; the point at issue was the right of intervention exerted by the emperor in elections to the German episcopate. Frederick was insistent that church property was bound to the sovereign by exactly the same obligations that were attached to the tenure of other property; in so doing he consistently advocated the type of church organization which existed under Charles the Great and Otto I, especially in regard to the landed possessions of the clergy. In reply Pope Hadrian (1157) asserted that

the right to the imperial crown depended on papal good will.

The final stage of the dispute took place between the emperor and Alexander III who, though he was opposed by an imperial anti-pope, managed by his alliance with the powerful free communes of northern Italy to inflict a distinct check upon the emperor. Frederick had secured the adhesion of his own clergy and the bishops to his national ideas of church government, and for this reason Alexander never dared to adopt such a drastic policy in dealing with this German monarch as Hildebrand had successfully applied to Henry IV in the previous century. Excommunication and dispensation from the oath of loyalty were the measures used to bring the emperor to reason. As a matter of fact, they proved of small avail; the German episcopate disregarded the papal mandate; there was no civil war, nothing to break the solid front presented by the German nation to the theocratic system. Where Frederick failed was in the attitude he took towards the Italian communes; they saw that their interest was on the side of the pope and it was their armies that gave the papal side the victory (Legnano, 1177). The obstinacy with which the emperor defended the rights of the State was in no small degree due to the revived study of the Roman civil law at Bologna, and to the influence upon his political ideals of his acquaintance with the despotic forms of the Byzantine Empire.

Without any spectacular display and only aided by

shrewd, persistent calculation, the French monarchy during the twelfth century was undermining the Hildebrandine constitution in France. The clergy made themselves the chief agents in the extension of the royal power, since in it they saw a secure protection from the lawless acts of the great feudal lords. High ecclesiastics, both bishops and abbots, were the representatives of the monarchy; in return they fully accepted the relationship of the ordinary vassal. The result of this alliance was the acquisition by the king of the Regalian rights in their fullest extent. This implied not only that the king received the income arising from church privileges, property, and from its feudal dues particularly, but that he also controlled the official acts of the episcopate and could appoint to benefices under episcopal jurisdiction. This last concession enabled the king to place in cathedral chapters enough of his nominees to direct the choice of the diocesan bishop.

The Church in England

These indirect methods of strengthening the monarchy in France were not imitated in England where there was a replica of the continental struggle between the emperor and the pope. The question in which Henry II and Thomas à Becket were the respective champions of Church and State concerned the jurisdiction of the royal courts. Under the settlement affected by William I the bishops were given the power of dealing with all crimes and torts in-

volving the clergy. In course of time this privilege, by an easy extension, was made to cover numbers of cases that might be claimed by the secular courts. The conflict of jurisdiction was as much a financial question as a matter of legal procedure, because for a mediæval monarch court fees were no inconsiderable factor in a primitive system of finance. The royal standpoint was aggressively stated in the Constitutions of Clarendon in 1164 which, besides reaffirming the old Norman principles of royal supremacy over the Church, limited the sphere of the clerial courts, bound the clergy in criminal matters to have recourse to the king's courts, forbade appeals from these to Rome and constituted them the final authority in all legal cases.

In preparing this anti-clerical policy the king's chancellor, Thomas à Becket, had a large share. It seemed the natural thing to promote him to the See of Caterbury to put it into effect. Becket was soon transformed from a loyal admirer of his king to a fervid champion of Hildebrandine church polity. He refused to accept the Clarendon decrees, though the majority of the English episcopate had done so. Becket was backed by the peasantry and townspeople, who saw in him, as champion of the clergy, the man who represented an order which stood between them and the exactions of an ascendent aristocracy which was itself largely the creation of the Norman Conquest. The long-drawn stages of this celebrated struggle were due both to the complexities of Henry II's

policy, in which the wide extent of his rule over French countries had to be kept in view, and also to papal diplomacy itself. Alexander III was troubled at this time by the creation of an anti-pope at the hands of Frederick I and he hesitated in his support of the archbishop to push Henry II so far that he might join the party of the emperor, and so accept the jurisdiction of the anti-pope. For six years the archbishop lived as an exile, and when he returned to his see in 1170 no permanent basis for peace had yet been found. On the 29th of December of the same year occurred the famous martyrdom in Canterbury cathedral when Becket lost his life because of his fidelity to Hildebrandine churchmanship. The assassination stirred not only England but the Continent, for everywhere the murdered archbishop was hailed as a saint and reverenced as a worker of miracles. Henry, who had difficulty in clearing himself of complicity in the crime by the most abject penitential penalties, found he could only make peace with the Church by withdrawing those features from the decrees of Clarendon which had been superadded to the traditions and practices of Norman kingship. He was obliged to sacrifice his opposition to appeals to Rome. In other respects the exercise of his sovereign rights over the English Church continued as before, according to the model introduced by the Conqueror. The civil wars later on in which he became involved with his sons had nothing to do with his ecclesiastical policy, and his defeat did not

weaken his control over the Church in his dominions.

Henry's reign is remarkable also ecclesiastically, because, owing to the extension of the English sovereignty over Ireland, the Irish Church emerged from its position of isolation. The Danish invasions in reducing the country to a chaotic condition had paralized Irish Christianity. When the invaders were Christianized some attempt was made to bring the bishopric of Dublin situated within the Danish Pale in relation with Archbishop Lanfranc and Gregory VII. In the interior things remained as they had been. The work of organization was taken up afterwards systematically by Malachi (1095-1148), who, first as coadjutor of Armagh and afterwards as tenant of the see, worked with success to model the Church in Ireland after the standards of England and the Continent. Through his close friendship with St. Bernard, both the Cistercian monks and the Augustinian orders were introduced. Not long after Malachi's death, the Irish Church was visited by a Roman legate and organized into four provinces and twenty-eight bishoprics under immediate papal supervision. This proved to be a mere paper constitution, because there was no power to put it into effect. For this reason Henry's plans to conquer the island were fully approved by Rome, which authorized him on the ground of the Constantinian Donation to invade the country, take possession of it, reform its morals and religion, only asking him in return to acknowledge the

pope as overlord in his tenure of the island, and to undertake to transmit Peter's pence to Rome. Henry, who fully understood monarchical church control at home found no difficulty in transplanting to Ireland the system he was familiar with in England. Bishoprics, priories, and monasteries were put under the immediate jurisdiction of the crown. All appointments were in the king's hands; Englishmen were given the important positions, and to the king's inventive mind was due the extension of the "spoliation" privileges from large foundations to the livings of petty incumbents. The Synod of Cashel, which took place not long after the murder of Archbishop Becket in 1171, registered these various changes, and the new arrangement was so much appreciated by the pope that he was willing to give Henry practically *carte blanche* in his management of Irish church organization in return for his recognition of papal supremacy.

Church Expansion

In Scandinavian lands the Hildebrandine organization of their churches advanced very slowly; there was a steady if rather inert opposition among all the Scandinavian nations against the systematic manipulations and the perfected machinery so dear to the Latin mind. Much more successful was the expansion, towards the northeastern Slavic lands, of German-speaking Christianity, as carried out under the guidance of the Cistercian and Præmonstra-

tensian orders. New sees and monasteries were founded in large numbers. The spread of Christianity was accompanied by a distinct economic advance; wherever the Cistercians settled they cleared away forest lands and drained marshes. Peasants were transferred from other monastic estates and induced to settle in lands where they acted as colonizing centres for the German Church. Church expansion here was equivalent to a permanent process of social change by which the whole character of Slavonic districts was altered.

The Later Crusades

The Asiatic extension of Latin Christianity went through many vicissitudes in the twelfth century. The states established by the crusaders lacked unity just when it was wanted; the Latin lords were jealous of one another and did all they could to sap the remaining strength of the Byzantine Empire. The occidental ecclesiastics only added a further troublesome factor to those who had to govern an alien population. By the help of a constant stream of pilgrims from the West and with the support of the sea-power of Venice, Pisa, and Genoa, the Christians secured and maintained their hold on the coast cities of Syria. In the interior, away from the fleets, practically no impression was made on the power of the Seljukian Turks. The most effective instruments for the occupation of the country were the two orders, the Templars and the Knights of St. John or the Hospitalers.

Both were great military organizations and so constituted what might be called the standing army of crusading lands. The Templars, founded in 1123 as an armed escort for groups of pilgrims, soon became engaged in independent military adventures. The Hospitalers kept closer to their original purpose of attending the sick, but both orders acquired wealth and large landed possessions, sometimes controlling whole towns. The crusading population, properly speaking, was chiefly French, while in the coast cities there were large colonies of Italians who had come there for the purpose of trade. To the Eastern Church the attitude of the Western Christians was most unfriendly and contemptuous; the only body of Eastern Christians to whom advances were made was the Armenian Church whose members, as a result of the Turkish conquests were scattered abroad throughout Asia Minor.

It was the aggressive attitude of the Seljuks, who finally took Edessa in 1144, that caused a fresh appeal to go forth in western Europe for help. St. Bernard added his powerful patronage and prophesied brilliant success for Christian arms. But failure followed; not only was Edessa not retaken, but even Antioch was threatened. The western princes in the crusade had their own special interests; King Roger of Sicily was diverted from an expedition in north Africa by his desire to revenge himself on the Byzantine emperor who was the ally of Conrad the German king. Louis of France saw no advantage in the crusade,

because there were no territorial acquisitions for him to secure. Matters in the crusading states went from bad to worse after the failure of this second exposition (1148). The Seljuks under Saladdin extended their conquests over the whole of Egypt and nearly the whole of Syria. Even Jerusalem fell into his hands in 1187. Outside northern Syria only Tyre, Tripolis, and Antioch remained under Christian control.

This catastrophe led to a third crusade, which was joined in by all the great monarchs of the West, including the emperor, Frederick I, Richard of England, and Philip Augustus of France (1188). Regular organized armies accompanied the western princes, but the expedition was ruined by the introduction also of western national politics. When Frederick met his death in Asia Minor (1190), his son Henry inherited not only his German possessions but also by marriage with the Norman heiress, Constance, became lord of Sicily as well. Such preponderance was regarded as dangerous by Richard I, who was sovereign over most of France as well as England. The actual achievements, therefore, of the crusade were inconspicuous; a three-years' armistice was granted with free entrance of pilgrims into Jerusalem (1192), and some small territorial concessions. Certainly not to be accounted in crusading victories was the conquest of Cyprus, an integral part of the Byzantine Empire, by Richard I of England and its subsequent transfer to a French noble house.

Innocent III

The conclusion of the crusade with the international rancors that developed from it brought about an anti-imperial alliance against Henry VI, whose well-planned schemes for supremacy seemed on the point of succeeding when he died in Sicily at the early age of thirty-two (1198), leaving as his heir a son who had not yet attained his majority. Henry's plans had involved the carrying out of his father Frederick's anti-papal policy, which had three aims: the acquisition of Sicily, by which the temporal power of the pope would become gradually squeezed out of existence; the acquisition of the dominions of Matilda of Tuscany, the supporter of Gregory VII who had donated her territory by will to the Roman See — a donation held to be invalid because without imperial consent; and lastly, the control over church patronage in Germany.

This was the imperial programme which Innocent III, who became pope in 1198 at the age of thirty-seven, devoted himself to destroy. Both a statesman and a well-trained jurist, the new pope, who had inexhaustible energy, followed in his attitude towards all other countries the principles he adopted to break down the imperial position. In Germany the matter was easy, for after Henry's death there was a disputed succession between his brother Philip and Otto of Brunswick, a powerful feudatory. Innocent successively allied himself with both parties, taking ad-

vantage in each case of every opportunity to secure recognition of his sovereignty over State as well as Church. He was the first pope to appeal explicitly to the coronation of Charles the Great as a fact which established the superiority of pope to emperor. The electoral rights of German princes were, therefore, he explained, only a concession from the papacy. As the coronation was a church ceremony, it appertained to the pope, he said, to decide as to the qualifications of the candidates, and also, in cases of disputed elections, to elect the proper candidate.

In Italy Innocent initiated with a lawyer's shrewdness the policy of "recoveries", a process analogous to the well-known "reunion" scheme of Louis XIV, by which that monarch cleverly annexed much disputed territory to France. Properties claimed as once ceded to the Roman See, on any kind of specious documentary evidence, good or bad, since they could never be alienated, were to be "recovered", simply by summary citation. It is remarkable how in a few months after Henry VI's death this method was successfully employed to eliminate German control over numbers of communes and localities in central and eastern-central Italy. But even this well-conceived plan for enlarging papal authority failed, as Innocent complained, to produce the expected results; for in many cases territories and estates fell directly into the hands of the local authorities who refused to give them up. In Sicily the pope encouraged an anti-German movement, by which the officials of Henry

VI were forced to leave the island and himself took over the guardianship of the young King Frederick II after the death of his mother Constance in 1198.

With all these advantages, Innocent's intervention in German affairs turned out badly; because neither of the imperial claimants were disposed to become the passive instruments of papal policy. The pope found, too, on more than one occasion during the civil war, that he was "putting his money on the wrong horse". Finally Philip, the claimant whom he last supported, was assassinated. Otto, the pope's first favorite, proved recalcitrant when he became the sole champion of the national party. So Innocent, in order to keep up the civil war which gave him enviable opportunities of fishing in troubled waters, found himself obliged to put forward his ward, Frederick, Henry VI's son and king of Sicily, as final claimant. By this act the pope prepared the way for the future union of Germany and Sicily, the very object he had worked so long to prevent. Even the period of civil war was brought to an unexpected close after the battle of Bouvines, when Otto, along with his English and French allies, met a disastrous defeat (1214). By 1218 Frederick II was the sole ruler over German lands, a position he was soon to use as the champion of the mediæval imperial state in its final conflict with the papacy.

In England Innocent's claims seemed destined to secure an easy triumph, because there he had as his opponent the weak son of Henry II, John, who by incapacity had lost all the advantage that came to him

as the heir of his father's extensive dominions on the Continent. The desired opportunity for papal intervention came as the result of a disputed election to the See of Canterbury. Innocent annulled the choice of the chapter and, asserting the right of the Roman See in such cases, caused his friend Stephen Langton to be chosen as Archbishop (1206). This was the first occasion that Rome had ventured to exercise the right of election in England, and when the King refused to accept the papal candidate, the country was placed under an interdict. There soon followed a decree of excommunication and John was deposed (1212). Philip Augustus of France was then authorized to lead a crusade against the recalcitrant country and take control of it. The nobles and clergy, incensed at the arbitrary behavior of John, sided with France. John, who soon realized his dangerous position, made his submission to the pope, received back his crown, as the liegeman of the Roman See (1213), and so secured the help of Innocent in his struggle against France and his rebellious subjects. But the papal programme was frustrated by the issue of the battle of Bouvines in which John found himself on the losing side. The result of his defeat was the celebrated Magna Charta, by which the clergy, with Stephen Langton at their head, and the nobility of England, secured a written acknowledgement of all their rights that had been exercised since the Norman Conquest (15th of June, 1215). John attempted to have this constitutional document nullified by the

pope's help; and Innocent formally condemned the Charter and excommunicated all those who observed its provisions. Archbishop Langton was suspended, and drastic measures were issued against the nobles and citizens of London. But popular feeling was so strong that after the death of John and Innocent the Magna Charta was set forth as the valid law of the kingdom by papal legates.

In France the weakness of England had helped Philip Augustus to secure a complete supervision over the nomination to many ecclesiastical posts. As the royal authority was extended, the existing rights of the great feudal landlords over bishoprics and abbeys fell into the king's hands. Wherever there was a financial or political advantage, the king showed himself most actve in securing it. The growth of free communes was encouraged, but nothing was done by the king to prevent the carrying of appeals to Rome. In his personal relations, Philip Augustus felt the weight of papal intervention; he was obliged, at Innocent's bidding to take back his first wife, from whom he had been separated shortly after his marriage.

In Spain the advance of Christian arms toward the south and the conquest of Portugal from the Moslems gave an opportunity to the papacy which was not neglected. The country was placed under the special protection of St. Peter, an action which might have had more important results had it not coincided with the temporary recrudescence of Moslem power.

Finally after crusading privileges had been accorded to those fighting on behalf of the Christian arms in Spain, the battle of Navas de Tolosa (1212) was such a blow to Moslem arms that by the middle of the century the whole of Spain was under Christian rulers, with the exception of the small Moslem enclave in the southeast, known as the Kingdom of Grenada.

The Eastern Churches

To the East Innocent devoted great attention; advances were made to the Armenians, the Greeks of the Eastern Empire and to the Slavonic peoples of the Balkan peninsula. Innocent's plan was to bring all the Eastern Churches under the Roman obedience, and then advance unitedly against Islam. The first stage was to be the cutting off of all commercial relations with Moslems; then a crusade was to be preached and large financial support secured by a general tax imposed on the whole of Christendom. The results were deplorably out of proportion to this grandiose scheme. Venice managed to divert the crusade to its own ends, chiefly the acquisition of commercial supreumacy in the Orient. The objective of the crusaders became Constantinople, not Palestine. In the spring of 1204 the capital of the Eastern Empire was taken by assault, and many of the most precious treasures of antiquity fell into the hands of the conquerors or perished by fire. No more consideration was shown to the inhabitants than if they had been Moslems; the land was under a western prince as

emperor, the provinces handed over to great western feudal families, chiefly French, and the Church received as its patriarch a Venetian ecclesiastic who was directed to introduce Roman customs of worship and organization. The experiences undergone by the Greek Christians at this time, in which they were treated as heretics and subjected to a genuine reign of terror, implanted in them that hatred and suspicion of Latin Christianity which still to-day impresses the visitor to the East.

In actual accomplishment this abortive cruasde prepared the way for further victories on the part of Islam because, by destroying the Byzantine Empire, it eliminated one of the chief Christian bulwarks in the East. Innocent, though himself an unsparing critic of the excesses of the crusaders, was willing to benefit by their actions; he was also not to be deterred by his previous experience from encouraging other attempts. Among these, certainly the most pathetically disasterous were the two Children's Crusades of 1212, which can only be explained on the ground that the pope, with all his legal acumen, was here a true product of the Middle Ages in his loyalty to an emotional and irrational idealism. The following year another papal appeal was made in which Innocent did not hesitate to encourage the undertaking by prophesying the near downfall of Islam. To prepare for the new expedition to the East, the great Lateran Council was called in 1215 as a great Christian congress to discuss ways and means.

The Separatist Movements

Among the important questions with which Innocent had to deal was that of heretical or separatist movements within the Western Church itself. We have already spoken of the successful propaganda of the Katharists in France and Italy. With the rapid extension of town life there came a demand for a clergy who knew how to preach and who also could follow the evangelical precepts as to purity and simple living, not alone in monastic retirement, but in the life of the ordinary everyday world. Inspired by convictions which this demand illustrates, a Lyonese merchant, Waldes, gave up his business (about 1173), became a wandering mendicant and later on undertook the work of preaching repentance in the streets and houses of towns. He was soon joined by numbers of men and women who imitated his manner of life, and were inspired by the same mission. When they were forbidden to do out-of-door preaching, Waldes appealed to Pope Alexander III, who referred him back to the head of his diocese. Silenced for a time, like the followers of John Wesley centuries later, they disregarded episcopal inhibitions, and resumed their open-air preaching.

As the movement spread, the Waldensians came into contact with a like-minded group of enthusiasts who had their centre in the Milanese brotherhood called "Humiliati", who like the Waldensians, had taken up the work of public preaching and associated

with it popular devotional meetings. They had been treated by the ecclesiastical authorities with the same rigor as the Waldensians. The radical wing of the "Humiliati" joined the followers of Waldes, and the group of men and women so constituted, after they had been formally excluded from the Church, undertook, under a privilege secured from Waldes himself, the regular administration of penitential discipline. About 1200 a schism arose over the question of organization between the Lyonese section, who stood for a regular graded system of official control, and the Lombard group, who held to the principles of an ecclesiastical democracy.

The chief factor in the Waldes movement was, as has been said, the administration of Penance. A specially selected circle of believers were appointed to proclaim God's forgiveness and appoint specific works of satisfaction. Membership in this circle was only open to those who lived a celibate life, were devoted to secret pastoral care, and carried it out under conditions of strict poverty. Special stress was laid by the Waldensians on Bible reading. Theologically, they show no approximation to the position taken up later by Luther, although they rejected the popular teaching of the Church as to Purgatory, Invocation of Saints, and Indulgences. No attempt was made by the Waldensians proper to organize separate communities; for all the sacraments apart from Penance, they were taught to depend on the regularly constituted authorities of the Church.

Much more antagonistic were the Lombard group of the official hierarchy. For a time they had their own baptisms and eucharists, because they held that the official clergy were living in mortal sin and could not validly administer these sacraments. When the time of persecution began they gave up this practice and followed the example of the French section, but soon they took up an attitude of irreconcilability to the whole system, external and internal, of the mediæval Church; then under the stress of circumstances, reservation was used as one finds so frequently in the sects of the time in unfolding the full 'credenda' to all of those who were connected with them. As to how far the influence of Katharism affected the Waldensians, there were just as many points of fundamental diversion as of contact. In their propaganda neither group of the Poor Brothers can be said to have shown any such powers of wide expansion as the Katharists, and where they overlapped it was always the first organization which predominated.

The growth of all of these movements must be set down to the inability of the Church to meet either the intellectual or the religious needs of town populations, and especially to understand that the artisan classes, who themselves lived under hard conditions, could only be evangelized by those who like them had no social influence and no property, and were also willing to endure the circumstances of a precarious living. In Innocent's time no attempt to contend

with heretical bodies on their own ground was consistently made, though a few leaders recognized the opportunity for something more Christian than punitive methods of repression. Innocent himself accepted the plan of campaign against the Lyonese worked out by his predecessors, i.e. the combination of church excommunication with civil outlawry. The pope too was moved strongly by the great accessions of strength to the Katharists. Punishment, confiscation, expulsion from their homes, seemed to have been applied effectively in Italian cities. In Aragon and Catalonia, in 1197, the death penalty was introduced.

In southern France, where the Katharists were most numerous, the application of vigorous measures was obstinately resisted by both the towns and the feudal aristocracy. The lead in this struggle was taken by Raymond, Count of Toulouse, the most powerful of all the nobles. To reduce the land to submission, a crusade was organized which was made up of contingents of warriors under their local leaders from northern France. This expedition made quick work of all heretics and their sympathizers; the repression was characterized by the worst kind of atrocities, and Raymond, who tried to save himself by compromise, found no place for conciliation. His lands were overrun by bands of trained soldiery under the orders of Count Simon of Montfort, who employed against his fellow countrymen the methods of warfare which were practised in the eastern crusading expeditions.

The climax was reached when the Lateran Council assigned to Simon all the land conquered by the crusaders, with Toulouse and Albi over which Raymond ruled, banished the count from his home and promised what was then left to Raymond's heir, subject to his good behavior.

Permanent machinery was now devised to secure the advantages already gained through the institution of the Inquisition. Previously the discovery and punishment of heresy had been left to the local officials of each diocese. On account of the laxity of local administration, the council of Verona, in 1184, had assigned the work of visiting all suspected parishes to special episcopal commissioners. Suspects were to appear before the bishop's court and apathetic prelates were threatened with deposition. To Innocent is due the carrying out in a drastic form of these measures. His legates were directed to remove careless bishops from their sees. In 1215 the Lateran Councl imposed upon secular officials the duty of driving out all heretical leaders from their territories; if they refused, repulsion by a crusade was to be applied. All ordinary members of heretical sects were to be excommunicated, and if they were not reconciled within a year they were to lose their civil rights. In order that each parish priest might be made responsible for the orthodoxy of those within his care, each parishioner was required to confess once a year to his priest, then make his Easter communion, and so prove his regular

connection with the Church. Other measures passed by the Council provided for the drawing up of a confession of faith, the improvement of clerical morals and a stricter intellectual preparation on the part of the clergy.

The Curial System

Innocent became the originator of a vast system of repression and discipline which maintained a remarkable degree of external orthodoxy and he so emphasized this aspect of church administration that even those who had no sympathy with the formal side of heretical movements felt the heavy hand of ecclesiastical oppression. In this pontificate of mighty plans and unique measures, because of the pope's insight into the details by which they were to be carried out, one sees the mediæval papacy at its highest point of efficiency. With all a lawyer's skill, the pope made the Hildebrandine theory workable. There was no danger now of being forced to use insufficient or antiquated legislation to deal with new problems as they arose. All decisions of the Roman See had the force of law. There was no necessity to wait for the halting action of synodical legislation. Obstacles in national churches to papal directions were carefully removed, for Innocent worked as determinedly against episcopal liberties as he did against the claims of the State to secure a sphere for itself in which the pope's word was no absolute.

Innocent took care to see that no one was appointed to a bishopric who would look to anyone else than the pope as his superior. Errors in procedure in episcopal elections were not difficult to discover, and where there was a doubt the pope exerted the right to name the candidate by laying down the conditions of a valid election, or in certain cases the nominee was bound to 'postulate' the Curia to discover whether the exact conditions had been fulfiled. The appellate system was largely used; and citations to Rome employed with regularity to hide episcopal depositions and so terriorize those who might show independent leanings or tend to depend on secular influence. The connection between the national sovereign and episcopal appointments was broken, though both in England and Gemany Innocent met strenuous opposition when he insisted on the principle of non-interference on the part of the State in elections to bishoprics. In both cases the weakness of the royal power due to civil disturbances often enabled the pope to carry his point.

Papal control had already been extended, as we have noted, from major to minor ecclesiastical positions. Recommendations to vacancies — the so-called "expectancies" — were made mandatory by Innocent, who, to justify this practice as well as the complimentary custom of "provisions" — the appointment by the pope to places vacated by the death of their incumbents in Rome — declared both to be based upon the plenary power inherent in the Roman See. A fur-

ther aim of papal policy was to secure the exemption of the clergy and all clerical property from the payment of taxes. To attain this, a canon was passed by which no legislation imposing such taxes could be accepted by the Church unless it had secured previously the consent of the pope. In these various fields Innocent attained success, but his whole programme of making the Church conterminous with the Empire in its jurisdiction and in its functions failed. It is true the Empire was destroyed, but in place of one great political power there sprang into existance many separate states which were able, by diplomacy or by obstruction, to wring concessions from Rome. The result of the Pope's centralizing policy on the Church was clear enough. He was the universal bishop and all the diocesan bishops merely his representatives in the dioceses. All the old orders were, the pope planned, to be remodelled along centralized lines, copied from the Cistercian order. In every direction Innocent aimed at the upbuilding of a great working machine with all its parts harmoniously disposed under one single control. The conscious realization of the purpose embodied in these claims and acts is seen in his adoption of the title "God's Vicar upon earth"; his predecessors had contented themselves with the designation "Vicar of Peter" or "Christ".

The Franciscans and Dominicans

It is refreshing to turn from the political-legal environment of the papacy, even when directed by a

statesman such as Innocent, to the field where spontaneous religious life springs, freed from the pressure of system and the influence of shrewdly calculated aims. It is one of those contrasts characteristic of mediæval life that a contemporary of Innocent should have been St. Francis of Assissi. Under influences resembling those which produced the Waldensian movement, Francis, giving up the life of a young man of affluence, devoted himself to a personal realization of the gospel precepts of absolute self-denial. He and his disciples took up the work of wandering preachers, assuming as well all kinds of menial service in behalf of their fellowmen. They worked not for gold but for self-subsistence, and so instilled respect for the Christian life in its highest potency. The name taken by Francis for his followers, the "Brothers Minor", was sanctioned and there was no danger of official opposition, because one of the first principles adopted by Francis was obedience to the authority of the Church. Innocent was wise enough to accept their rule, and also to allow their preaching. So popular did the Franciscan movement become that even before the Saint's death the extension of the work was planned for all the lands of western Europe, to which was soon added missionary propaganda in Syria and Tunis.

As the sphere of work grew larger more attention was paid to organization. Instead of a wandering life the members of the new order formed permanent settlements in cities. The original principles of the

order suffered by this transformation to regularity and mechanism; what was left of the original inspiration of a unique personality was the denial of property, either personal or corporate, the abstention from all hoarding of money and the practice of begging as the sole source of income of the order. This last, the mendicant feature, was made predominant in the papal bull of 1223, by which also the connection of the order with the Roman See was emphasized. After all this newly provided machinery, which reflects the official spirit of the Curia, Francis appears as the general of the order with a regularly graduated hierarchy of subordinates beneath him, so constituting an organization which could be readily used to carry out any directions from the supreme head of the Church.

With Francis of Assisi there is always closely associated the other characteristic personality of the same period, St. Dominic (d. 1221), who also devoted himself to a life of apostolic poverty with the direct purpose of overcoming the attraction of heretical movements. Preaching in churches and the hearing of confessions were the chief obligations of the Dominicans; and with these duties was combined devotion to theological studies as a valuable weapon of overcoming in debate heretical opponents. No manual labor was to be done, no property held, and no regular income permitted. In their organization these new orders offered a striking contrast to the old. There was no local autonomy such as was found in the abbeys of the monastic communities. In their

centralization the Franciscans and Dominicans followed the model of the great military orders. At the head was a general directly responsible to the pope. All the other officials were nothing more than administrators who carried out directions received from above. The individual member of the community felt that his only real superior was the general. The special contribution of both orders is seen in the acceptance of an ideal of monastic perfection, not to be realized in isolation, but in association with lay society as a whole. While the Dominicans devoted themselves to preaching, the Franciscans found their chief sphere in works of philanthropy among the lower classes. As time passed, the line of demarcation between the two orders became obliterated. Even Francis himself lived long enough to deplore the changes that took place contrary to the spirit of his rule.

The popularity of these new creations of monastic rule called forth many imitations; the only organizations, however, which secured papal approval were the Augustinian Hermits and the Carmelites (1243 and 1247). All of these orders of friars, as they were called, were endowed with peculiar privileges by the pope. They were exempted from diocesan jurisdiction, and so came into active rivalry with the parochial clergy in the cure of souls. Their success in winning converts, and the influence they attained, made them the most valuable allies in securing for the papacy the support of the lay element in every community when

the conflict between State and Church became acute. The career of Francis gave a permanent direction also to mediæval piety; the spontaneous character of his religion, with its union of emotional freedom and ascetic rigidity, brought him close to popular feeling. Questions of church policy were outside his ken; he was willing to follow his superior's bidding; within a system he did not pretend to understand, he found room for noble aspirations, a simple life and self-sacrificing acts. Interesting in this connection is the dictum of Innocent IV, a pope of this age: "It is enough for a layman", he said, "to believe in a God who exacts retribution; in all other things to believe implicitly the teaching as to dogma and morals"; i.e. to think and to say, "I believe what the Church believes."

Indulgencies and Confession

Illustrative of the popular religious psychology of this period was the interest in miraculous happenings, and for this reason emotional and mystical preaching appealing to the desire for the miraculous continued to be characteristic of the mendicant orders. They produced some splendid types of religious oratory, but, as might be expected, the insistence on fixed standards of popular piety led to crudities and vulgarities of diction and thought. In order to hold the attention of the masses, and also to secure a permanent source of income for expensive foundations, which according to their rules had no landed estates

to depend upon, the friars made extensive use of systematic collection of alms. A lucrative source of income came from their special privileges in connection with the distribution of indulgences, which during the crusading period were found capable of wide extension as a means of attracting recruits for the armies that were constantly being sent to the East. Not only those who joined but those who sent substitutes had this privilege. Finally, under Innocent IV, an indulgence might be given to one who was willing to settle in cash for a vow made in a crusade. Indulgences could be had for the performances of certain specified good works, such as hearing a crusade sermon, and the right to distribute them was conceded to churches and monasteries as sources of income.

With the spread of this custom, the old disciplinary usages of the Church were completely transformed. Absolution was given immediately after confession, and not deferred until the due performance of penitential acts of retribution and satisfaction. No such indication of penitence was asked for now. Forgiveness and restoration to grace was made dependent on the sacramental act of the priest alone, while the element of satisfaction took a secondary position. The inquiry in the confessionnal centred about secret faults, sins of omission or commission not openly known. Contraventions of the moral law could be thus atoned for by public acts of penance with an emphasizing of the sacramental factor in absolution;

the element of personal contribution, grew to have less importance. By the thirteenth century the theory was accepted that the penitent, in order to be the subject of the priest's absolving power, need only feel attrition, i.e. the fear of the extreme penalties of his sin, and not be moved either by love of God or by abhorrence of the sin itself. So far as is known the mass of lay people were not expected to show more devotion than that warranted by the decree of the Lateran Council, which appointed, as we have said, a yearly confession previous to the Easter communion.

To the immediate influence of St. Francis is to be ascribed the systematic extension of the lay brotherhood movement. What had been local organizations, now became a part of a world-wide order. Those who wished to follow the Franciscan ideal of life and yet were hindered by home ties might join the so-called 'third' order, which held to simplicity of life, strictness of conduct and the performance of good works. Apart from the Franciscan and Dominican 'third' order, there were popular movements elsewhere of an organized type, and most interesting among these being the Beghines of the Low Countries, bands of women mostly, who might live as hermits in the country districts, dwell in communities where they undertook philanthropic work, or even in their own homes might practise a life of devotion and restraint. Sometimes under the elasticity of this rule they were altogether free from any sort of superior direction;

at other times, they were connected more or less closely with the official mendicant orders with whose general ideals they closely sympathized. The curious name by which they were designated comes from the soubriquet of their founder, Lambert, a priest of the Lower Rhine district, called the Stammerer (li Beges), who had great success as a mission preacher at the close of the twelfth century. This order continued to present the general Franciscan ideal of a wandering life devoted to mendicancy without productive labor, but controlled by none of the restrictions which were imposed upon the regular friars.

The Universities

While these popular religious forces grew up in the south of France and in Italy, the home of intellectual life continued to centre in Paris, where Abelard's influence was still potent. Two special groups of independent teachers are to be distinguished. One which gathered about the abbey of St. Genevieve, the other on the Isle de Paris round the cathedral church of Notre Dame. Jurisdiction over these last was by royal licence intrusted to the episcopal chancellor. In or about the year 1200 the teachers organized themselves into a corporation "universitas", which papal favor was able to resist the chancellor's claim of control. In course of time the chancellor became an official whose authorized privileges of teaching were given no longer in the name of the diocesan, but with papal recognition were valid for the whole Church.

About the same time the teachers of Oxford became formally organized; somewhat later, 1230, the University of Cambridge came into existence.

Paris continued, however, to hold the primary place; the others followed its methods and introduced by its example the dialectical scheme of philosophical and theological study founded by Abelard. Fresh impetus was give by the use of new sources in the wider range of Aristotelian writings now accessible and in the commentaries on his works by Arab and Jewish authors. The patheistic tendencies of much of this material and the influence it exerted over contemporary writers caused the Paris Council of 1210 to condemn both this school of philosophy and also the use of books by Aristotle and his Oriental and Spanish interpreters. In 1215 the papal legates at the University of Paris condemned Aristotle's metaphysical writings. But the direction taken by popular thought was too strong to be overcome; finally Gregory IX left open all of the works hitherto mentioned, an exception being made of Erigena. While this radical change was being recognized by the highest authority in the Church, the universities began to be frequented by members of the mendicant orders.

In Paris their invasion was much resented by the corporation of resident teachers. Papal privileges, however, soon made it possible both for the Franciscans and Dominicans to gain admission to the most important chairs, and teachers of these orders soon came to have a prominent place in Paris, Oxford and

Cambridge. Unincumbered by educational tradition these progressive scholars were able to use the newly opened sources of philosophic thought from an independent point of view, to comment upon them freely and to combine them in imposing system which drew hosts of students to attend their lectures. Albert the Great (1193-1280), a Dominican, was the first to work up the whole of Aristotle's writings into a finished theological corpus.

Even more characteristic of the period was his disciple Thomas Aquinas (1225-1274), who by his intellectual acumen, wide reading and mental balance, appropriated the extant sphere of knowledge and from it constructed a system of thought which showed how in an ordered and perspicuous whole the most varied problems of philosophy, cosmology, ethics and sociology, could be handled with the conscious purpose throughout of connecting all these spheres of interest with the teaching and authority of the Church. Another direction of thought is seen in the work of the Franciscan scholar, Bonaventura, who incorporated in the regular dialectical form of the day the mystical position found in the writings of Dionysius the Areopagite, to the exclusion of the types of discussion encouraged by the study of Aristotle. Suspicion of dialectic was now overcome because of its use by scholars of the mendicant orders, who showed ho wit could be employed in the service of orthodoxy. Church dogmas, practices and claims could either, it appeared, find rational justification, or by careful dis-

tinctions be placed in the catagory of articles of faith where the criticism of rationalizing thought might not be applied.

The Mystics

Apart from, yet almost contemporary with, this splendidly developed systematic teaching in support of the existent church organization, in theory and in practice, there was a critical movement, not at all intellectual in its aims, which revived spontaneously the apocalyptic traditions of the Early Church. Depending upon a platonizing mysticism, it rejected all the externals and formalism of historical doctrine and discipline and laid exclusive stress on the personal relation of the soul with God, as the sole factor of religion. With this point of departure it could hardly fail to encourage a severe judgment of the visible phenomena of ecclesiastical life, and exactly at this point appears a protest within the frame of apocalyptic speculation against the finality of current theological thought. Joachim of Fiore, first a Cistercian and afterwards a Benedictine abbot (ob. 1212), divided the religious history of mankind into three periods — the reign of the Father, or the law; the reign of the Son, or the sacramental and hierarchical dispensation; this was then to be succeeded by the third period, the dispensation of the Holy Spirit, in which all external media of the soul's approach to God would be done away. Church, papacy, monasticism, sacraments the humanity of Christ, all would be dissolved

to give place to the eternal substantial elements which in a shadowy, incomplete form they represented. The Coming age was to begin in 1260, and would be announced by a period of catastrophic visitations,—the appearance of Antichrist, the preaching of the eternal Gospel, and the gathering of the nations into the Church. Much more radical was the standpoint of Amalrich of Bennes (ob. 1204), who enlarged with much satisfaction on the details of the era of change which was to usher in the era of the Spirit. In the conditions of his own time he saw the marks of the reign of Antichrist and found in a group of faithful followers the nucleus from which would develop the kingdom of the Holy Spirit, their origin being revealed by special revelations in movements of rapt ecstasy. In the present institutions of the Church might be discovered additional grounds for the actual presence of the time of dissolution, and Amalrich, going back to the phrasology of the Johannine Apocalypse, did not hesitate to call the Church Babylon, the pope Antichrist, and the clergy the servants of Antichrist. It was the speculative basis of Amalrich's teaching that made the authorities of the Church look suspiciously at the origins of scholastic philosophy with its appeal to Greek and Arab authors and secured the permanent condemnation of Erigena, whom Amalrich was accustomed to regard as his main authority.

Frederick II

While in so many directions the Church after the time of Innocent III was revealing unlooked-for resources in great intellectual and devotional movements, politically after his period the papal system adhered to the constitutional and political standards which characterized his pontificate. The last stage of the conflict with the State is noteworthy because of its leading figure, Frederick II, who in many ways anticipates the representatives of enlightened absolutism in the eighteenth century. Frederick had to plan his campaign against papal autocracy at considerable disadvantage. To Germany, worn out by civil strife, he was a foreigner and his ideals of government were also altogether alien. It was the traditions of Norman Sicily with its trained beaurocracy and its mercenary troops that he tried to introduce as the basis for a centralized kingdom on the Continent. The Lombard cities stoutly resisted the application of a system of government which would have destroyed them. The complexities of Frederick II's policy are not easily followed unless one appreciates that this conflict was a combined move against the feudalized state, communal independence and papal theocracy led by a man who had the temperament of Lucian and Voltaire. He was often willing to sacrifice one point of his programme to gain a more immediate advantage; so we find him at one time figuring as a crusader, at another gaining aid from

German feudal lords by extending the limits of their local jurisdiction.

The relentless animosity of the Curia was due to his advance in middle Italy, by which the temporal dominions of the Roman See were visibly threatened. When after the battle of Cortenuova (1237) the Lombard cities, because of their defeat, were about to be brought into his centralized system of government—which meant the creation north as well as south of Rome of a strong executive power established in accordance with the Sicilian model—Frederick was excommunicated (1239). No concessions could appease Innocent IV, who set himself everywhere, not in Italy alone, to destroy the imperial power. In 1245 a council was called at Lyons by which Frederick was deposed and a new royal election ordered. In every land where Frederick's authority was recognized, a crusade was preached. Sums collected for the aid of Eastern Christians were devoted to this new cause. Most powerful aid against the emperor was contributed by the active members of the mendicant orders who could use their hold over the people to spread in all classes the invincible hatred which the acts of Frederick had inspired in the Curia. In the civil war which followed the emperor was backed by the towns in Germany, while in Italy he was regarded as their most formidable enemy. The uprising against him he repressed with such ferocity that in Italian quarters it was really believed that the Age of Antichrist had come.

The struggle left the Empire, at the time of his death in 1250, financially exhausted, and there was no question of the victory of the papacy when his successor, Conrad, failed to retrieve the fortunes of the Hohenstaufens (ob. 1254). In Germany and in Burgundy the basis of imperial rule was broken; but a revival took place in Italy under King Manfred, a son of Frederick, who, using only his natural position as Italian king, placed himself at the head of all the anti-Roman, i.e. the Ghibelline, parties throughout the peninsula. By offering the Sicilian crown to Charles of Anjou, brother of Louis IX, king of France, the popes who supported their champion with profuse financial liberality were able to destroy Manfred and his kingdom and finally put to death the last male heir of Frederick II. By 1267 French rule was firmly established over all the Italian territories formerly controlled by the imperial German house. Charles of Anjou, as Protector of the Holy See, saw to it that French influence was made predominant through the appointment of French cardinals. It was soon a question whether the papacy itself would not become an appanage of Charles, and also whether theocratic rule would continue to be directed by one man, or be put in commission under the direction of a body of cardinals controlled by the French champion of the papacy.

The Inquisition

The age that was marked by the implacable contest with Frederick II also witnessed a further ad-

vance in the perfection and extension of the Inquisition. It became so admirable an engine of repression that Frederick himself used it against his political enemies. The officials of the church system were, apart from the papal legates, exclusively members of the mendicant orders who were assigned independent authority in the detection of heresy. Great attention was given to the development of the procedure in such cases and the accused had small chance of clearing himself. In manifold ways through the use of torture and denunciation, coupled with the direct and indirect extraction of implicating evidence from willing and unwilling witnesses, a legal process opposed in all its forms to the instincts of justice was produced under the seal of ecclesiastical sanction. The penalties were made more consistently brutal. The division already noticed between lands which practised the death penalty and those where heresy was punished by exappropriation of property disappeared. Both penalties were now combined; the obstinate culprit was burnt, all his property confiscated, and his children had no right of succession. Only countries where heretical movements were unimportant were preserved from the iniquities of the inquisitorial process. In this happy catagory are to be placed Castile, England, Portugal, and the lands lying east of the German Empire.

It can hardly be denied that this horrible method of repression, by which the executioner became the minister of the historic orthodox faith, achieved re-

sults. Both the Katharists and the Waldensians lost ground; their adherents in order to exist were obliged to cease from propagating their doctrines, or to take refuge in remote neighborhoods.

The Eastern Question

While these questionable successes are to be recorded in favor of the system modelled by Hildebrand and applied by Innocent III, the situation in the East was not improved. Probably inspired by trade interests, the thirteenth century crusaders made the chief objective of their attacks the towns of the Egyptian coast. These all failed; even the valor and the virtues of St. Louis could accomplish nothing in Egypt (1248-1254). Paradoxically enough, it was Frederick, the rationalist and the opponent of the papacy, who managed to arrange the best terms with the Moslem conquerors of Palestine. In 1229 he made a treaty with the Sultan, Alkamil, by which that ruler agreed to hand over to Christian hands Jerusalem, some other places on the main lines of approach to the Holy City, and preserve peace for a term of ten and a half years. Frederick, who had been excommunicated, found that papal sympathizers and papal troops in Syria were able to defeat his crusade by diplomacy. He withdrew and all the advantages he had secured were lost. The Mongol conquests in the East proved disappointing; though the Turkish Sultanates were overcome one by one, all the coast towns in Christian hands fell under the power of the "Mameluk" Sul-

tans before the end of the century. The Latin kingdom of Constantinople, a purely artificial creation, collapsed in 1261, when the Greek emperial family, the Palæologi, took possession of the capitol. Latin principalities continued long in existence further south but added no strength to the Christian power in the East, for much of the attention of the restored Greek Empire was not directed to withstanding the Turk in Asia Minor, but in contending with the Latins for control of land in the Balkan peninsula.

As all attempts to bring the Greek or Russian Church into subordination to the See of Rome failed, the papacy began to negotiate with the Mongol monarchs, who controlled vast Asiatic possessions, with a view to take advantage of the principle of toleration practised in their empire. Some Christian tribes remained unmolested within its borders, and it is known that physicians belonging to the Nestorian faith were in high favor at the court of the Mongol emperors. This was enough to induce Innocent IV, the bitter opponent of Frederick II, to send a deputation of mendicant friars to the court of the grand Khan south of Lake Baikal. Nothing was accomplished in the way of the extension of Christianity, but the friars opened up the way to the occidental trader. The Venetian, Marco Polo, a few years later penetrated as far east as China, and by bringing back with him the knowledge of the wide extension of Nestorian Christianity, encouraged the Western Church to undertake real missionary propaganda in

distant lands. Up to this time the movement of Christian expansion had chiefly followed the line of advance in the lands east of the German Empire, where the contest against heathen Slavs and Lithunians was conducted by a special order, the Teutonic Knights, who were placed under the immediate headship of the pope (1230).

Anti-Papal Movements

The long struggle with Frederick II caused the papacy to extend in every direction its machinery of centralization. Practically the existence of autonomy of any kind was guarded against. Constitutionally this process is seen in a most significant form, when Gregory IX in 1234 sent to all the universities his new collection of papal decretals with directions that no other source for church law could be used. These decretals contained along with new legislation instances cited where the ancient law of the Church was abrogated at the pope's discretion. In Jurisprudence the ecclesiastical courts received a much wider jurisdiction than ever before. Matters of church property, marriage, probate of wills, obligations made under oath, usury, were all included. In addition questions concerning widows, orphans, and crusaders might be brought under their purview. The use of these courts was popular with the laity because they followed the clear precedents of Roman civil procedure and were under the direction of a class of trained officials.

Financially the period was marked by further elaboration of papal taxation. The crusades were used as a frequent excuse for imposing money contributions: "provisions", pensions, fees from law suits, all went to support various curial officers and their dependents, an affliction easily justified by the maxim that the property of the Church was naturally vested in its sole head and governor, the pope. It was the judicial and the financial system of the papacy that brought it into antagonism with the states of western Europe, France, and England, where a monarchial executive was most completely established. On several occasions the French nobles agreed to ressit as a unit the financial impositions of the Church and the encroachments of the ecclesiastical courts. But an alliance was soon effected by which the monarchy under Louis IX stood in close alliance with the papacy. We have already seen in the field of international politics the benefits derived from this understanding by the French king's brother, Charles of Anjou. In England under the weak Henry III, papal finance and papal office-holders stirred up vigorous antagonism among both aristocracy and the clergy. Robert Grosseteste (1235-1253), the Bishop of Lincoln, has a worthy place in the annals of the English Church as the champion of its national rights against the papacy, which was more and more coming to be a great juristic and financial machine, threatening the foundation of national existence.

The result in England was that the extravagant

demands of papal absolutism were checked. The papacy had been foolish enough to ally itself with the monarchy; accordingly with the rise of parliamentary government at the close of the thirteenth century, the two types of absolutism,— papal and royal,— had to bow to the force of popular opinion legally expressed in the nascent representative system.

No matter how regularly and how skilfully the advance towards uniformity was worked by the curial machinery, absolute security could not be reached; nor was nationalism the only obstructive element. Even in the Franciscan order, where obedience to the central organ of the Church was an essential feature of discipline, there were protests made when the directions of St. Francis himself were disregarded, after the order undertook to make permanent establishments in cities and when its members aimed to increase their influence by becoming teachers and writers; yet all these changes were made with Pope Gregory IX's consent.

Though what might not inaptly be called "modernism" prevailed in the order, some friars were troubled by the growth of worldy tendencies, which they interpreted as a result of the general absorption of the Church itself in secular interests. As a refuge from temporal distress they adopted the apocalyptic teaching of Joachim di Fiore. Official sanction was given to it by John of Parma, general of the order, who published in 1204 Joachim's writings as the authoritative teaching on the third age of the

Church. This action was made use of by the University of Paris to initiate a general attack on Franciscan teaching. Within the order itself the radical doctrines were drastically repressed, although Pope Alexander IV decided that the teaching of Joachim was not heretical.

CHAPTER V.

THE DECLINE OF THE HILDEBRANDINE PAPACY

WITH the disappearance of Germany as an imperial power that had to be reckoned with, the contest of Church and State was still far from being settled. Only the ground of contention was shifted. Taxation, not investiture, was now the burning question, because the financial side of church administration from Rome became even more prominent now that exactions were imposed upon every country to support crusades, and to suppress heresy. These obligations were paid in precious metals or negotiable papers; hence the papal financial system contributed largely to spread in Europe a general banking organization, and brought into existence a host of agents engaged in providing for the collection and transportation of money to the papal treasury. The economic advantages of this new kind of international finance were not lost on the national kingdoms who became anxious to apply it locally for their own benefit, or were given a share in it by the Curia itself as a return for favors received. Causes of conflict also arose in the competition of the law officers of the Church with those of the State, and not infrequently, too, as happened in Languedoc, a number of artisans and merchants took the tonsure in order to claim ex-

emption from the secular taxes. It will be remembered that Innocent III had already decided that members of the clergy were free from the financial obligations of the ordinary citizen.

The Papacy and the French Monarchy

This issue came up in an acute form between Philip le Bel, King of France, and Boniface VIII (1294-1303). Philip would tolerate no exemptions and proceeded to pass strict legislation against the exportation of the precious metals. Boniface expressed the claims of the clergy in the most exaggerated form, especially in the famous bull *Unam Sanctum* which, in precise scholastic language, formulated the full Hildebrandine theory of the superiority of ecclesiastical over secular power, that involved the complete dependence of the State on the Church. Philip was excommunicated; he then not merely announced the calling of a council to depose the pope, but sent trusted agents to Italy to take him prisoner. The plan succeeded because Philip found ready allies in some of the nobles of the Campagna, who forcibly entered the palace at Anagni where Boniface was staying and held him for a time prisoner. The shock was too much for the aged pope, who died soon after in Rome (October 11, 1303).

In England violent methods were not followed, yet sure results were reached which kept the financial contributions of the clergy to the support of the State from being under papal supervision. At the very

time when the middle classes were being organized by their representatives in parliament in the House of Commons to deliberate over the questions of supplies, the lower orders of the clergy were brought together in a convocation, a new type of synod, a part of whose duty was to impose taxes on the clerical orders of the realm.

The result of the conflict with France was completely disastrous to the papacy of the Hildebrandine type. For some time French influence had been potent in the College of Cardinals because of the position voluntarily conceded by the Curia to Charles of Anjou and his family. The experience of lawlessness at Anagni was soon used as an excuse when a Frenchman was selected pope, as Clement V was in 1304, to remove the papal government and its head to Avignon which, after several other places in France were used as temporary shelters, became the permanent ecclesiastical capital after 1309 and retained this position for nearly seventy years, a period which for this reason is called the Babylonian Captivity. Avignon did not itself become the actual property of the Holy See until 1348, when it was bought from Johanna of Naples for 80,000 gold florins; but close to the city was a small territorial possession which had been acquired by the papacy more than three generations before Clement's elevation. Perhaps too much is made of the term "captivity", for during this period the Avignon popes did not live on territory under the immediate control of the King of

France, nor, as we have seen, does the removal to Avignon mark the beginning of French influence over papal policy. But the immediate proximity of the French royal house was certainly welcomed and desired, because in Italian politics the French sympathizers were always in the anti-Ghibelline or pro-papal side, and as time went on the French party in the College of Cardinals so grew in importance that they became predominant as a national force, and could be counted on to support French policy.

The purpose of the Capetian kings to use the papacy for their own ends was seen at the beginning of Clement V's pontificate in the supression of the Templar order when the pope, who feared that Philip would carry out his intention of having Boniface VIII declared a heretic by a General Council, acted as the willing instrument of the royal wishes. The Templars were singled out for attack because they had in France enormous landed estates and did a large banking business. They were a close corporation, enjoying independent jurisdiction and many exemptions: they were therefore the object of popular envy and also suspected because of the mystery surrounding their rules. Many scandalous stories were told of their depravity; these were fabrications, but the Templars, after the abandonment of the crusades, had outlived their usefulness. It was by no means an accident, however, that King Philip was heavily indebted to them, and that he was also on the verge of financial ruin. High-handed measures were

taken against the order in October, 1307, when directions were given for the general seizure of their property, and at the same time steps taken to bring them before the court of the Inquisition as suspects of heresy. The acts of suppression were horrible in the extreme; where torture was used, the victims were willing to confess almost anything suggested to them. In other countries than France, where milder methods were employed by the Inquisitors, it was plain that the list of offences were nothing more than a fabrication. The pope played a most pitiable rôle in this famous process; for he did everything to accentuate the cruel features of the trial procedure. There were many burnings; one important council, that of Sens, condemned as many as fifty-four knights to the flames. At the Council of Vienne, in 1313, when the members refused to pass sentence of condemnation on the order, the pope took the matter out of their hands and transferred all their property to the Knights Hospitalers, and then published his sentence of condemnation. King Philip was able to have the conditions of the transfer of the Templar's property so arranged that he paid off his own debts, took posession of the gold and silver in their hoards, converted their financial machinery to his own use, and even went so far as to collect imaginary debts owed to the Temple. The pact was then completed between the papacy and the French monarchy; for the case against Boniface VIII was dropped. It had already been agreed that the king had acted in accordance with the dictates of

his conscience and that those who had charged the dead pope with every kind of crime had only sinned through excessive zeal. All that the Council did was to pass general resolutions of the same character exculpating both sides and expressly declaring that Boniface VIII had been a legitimate pope.

The Hildebrandine System Attacked

It can be seen that the initial stage of the papal residence across the Alps was discreditable, and as other popes succeeded Clement V at Avignon, nothing was done to make the papacy more respected. Such rehabilitation was necessary because one of the new features of the struggle between the French monarchy and the papacy was the discovery that there was a public opinion which could be influenced and whose influence counted for something. Among those who supported Philip were the writers who prepared the arguments for his publicity bureau, and who in their presentation of the king's case exalted the national rights of the State over against the Church. The two spheres they contended were separate; the Church should be restricted to religious duties and the care of souls, while the State in the field of law and government should be supreme. The pope, they affirmed, was the Vicar of Christ only in relation to the humiliation of the Son of God, while the secular power had its own proper work in the service of Christian social order and the maintenance of good conduct and good citizenship.

This position was fully developed later in the century by Marsilius of Padua and Johann of Landau who, when the imperial claims were revived in Germany, appeared as strong antagonists of theocratic principles. The heavenly law they contended was a matter for the future life, and in this world the hierarchy of the Church cannot properly wield the attributes of civil power. Besides the Church itself must not be identified with the clerical order. The whole Christian community with its regular executive heads and its councils were the depositories of sovereign power. These councils, composed of both clergy and laity, have the right alone to interpret authoritatively the infallible word of God and prescribe general rules for the Church. The pope is not the successor of St. Peter by divine right; for historical causes have elevated the Bishop of Rome to his position. Strictly, the papacy depends on the will of the General Council or the Christian community, and therefore the pope can only issue orders which concern ecclesiastical life. His proper sphere is to carry out the directions of the council, to act as arbitrator in controversies; but even here his action must be regulated in harmony with the aims of the secular power.

Papal Finance

This atmosphere of protest was general and there was no moral nor material element in the Avignon papacy to dissipate its force. In the first place, the financial position of the Curia was anything but

satisfactory. Resources from the lands under its temporal sovereignty were much diminished because of the troubled state of Italy. This financial strain was accentuated because of the amounts diverted by the popes themselves to the various members of their families. There were the sums of money spent in building at Avignon, the expenses of warfare in Italy itself, with the subsidies paid to the pope's allies of the Guelf party. These heavy drafts on the papal treasury had to be met by the creation of new resources, chiefly in the way of high fees on documents that passed through the Curia in its business of conceding dispensations, indulgences, absolutions, privileges, graces, exemptions, and grants. For the same reasons the rights of papal patronage were extended even beyond the limits already noted, and most of the higher offices of the Church could now only be filled by papal action. The general rule was to exact a third to a half year's income from any officer who owed his appointment to the pope — the so-called Annates. Ways were found, too, to increase the voluntary offerings of diocesan bishops and the faithful generally. If the amounts were not paid the delinquents were exposed to excommunication and their country to an interdict. All of such acts were justified by the maxim, "Simony is not committed in the Curia."

The influence of the system was most deplorable; positions in the Church began to be treated everywhere as sources of income. Its effect on the parochial clergy was especially burdensome; foreigners

were given positions without any obligation to perform the duties attached to them. Benefices were joined together, others were incorporated with rich monastic foundations, and secular clergy was then employed at the lowest competitive labor rates to undertake the official duties of the parochial cure. The capitalistic and financial character of the Avignon period was revealed unpleasantly when John XXII interfered in the internal dispute of the Franciscan order. Those who kept up the agitation for a strict observance of the Founder's rule, the so-called Spirituals appealed to the example of Christ and the Apostles, who, they claimed, had no private property. This statement was declared to be heretical by a Dominican Inquisitor. The order refused to abide by this decision, and the pope, in the bull *Ad Conditorem* (1322), accomplished a master stroke by forbidding all future gifts made to the order to be held in trust, as it had been done in the past, by the Roman Church. He followed up this act by declaring the proposition which affirmed the poverty of Christ to be heretical. The matter was later on arranged by allowing the property possessed and used by the order to continue to be vested in the donors, but this result was reached only after a long and bitter controversy in which many Franciscan writers took up a decided anti-papal position and became supporters of Louis the Bavarian (1313-1347), who as holder of the imperial title revived on a small and ineffective scale the traditions of the Hohenstaufen age.

The Schism

Though the popes seemed securely established in Avignon, the stability of the arrangement was not assured. In the first place, the exile outraged public opinion. Literary men, such as Petrarch and devout personalities such as St. Bridget of Sweden, demanded that the pope should no longer live away from his see. Absenteeism, too, had worked disaster on papal territory in Italy; so much so that Innocent VI (1352-1362) had sent an army under Cardinal Albornoz to overcome his revolted subjects. Rome and other cities of the patrimony were now republics. Though the cardinal's campaign was successful, the presence of the pope was needed to complete it. Besides the positive advantages of the Avignon residence as a secure place could no longer be maintained after the city had been besieged by a large band of freebooters in 1370, and only saved from assault by the payment of a heavy ransom. It had been ravaged also by the plague. These unfavorable local conditions were accentuated by the decline of the French monarchy itself, which, because of the war with England, could no longer act as protector of the papacy. Urban V (1362-1370) passed two years of his pontificate in Rome, but allowed himself, through the influence of the French cardinals, to take up again his residence in Avignon where he died two months after his return. His successor, Gregory XI (1370-1378), alarmed by the news that Italian Guelfs and Ghibellines alike

were plotting to destroy the Temporal Power, and influenced, too, by the incessant and powerful appeals from St. Catherine of Siena, whose virtue and piety made her, despite her youth, a powerful ally of those who demanded that Avignon be abandoned, returned finally to Rome (1377).

This abnormal period of absenteeism had hardly closed when a far worse situation was inaugurated by a schism in the Church. Gregory's sucessor, Urban VI, an Italian, was elected in Rome under circumstances of popular commotion, because of which it was claimed the Conclave had not been free to follow its own choice. This claim did not occur to the cardinals until they found that the new pope was bad-tempered and dictatorial and in no way inclined to treat them as members of a privileged corporation in which the pope would figure as the presiding officer. A new Conclave was held by the seceding cardinals, all Frenchmen, who proceeded to elect a French-speaking pope, Clement VI, who, after vainly trying to get possession of Rome, withdrew to Avignon. There were now two ecclesiastical capitals of western Christendom with a divided allegiance, the southern countries, on the whole, following the obedience of the Avignon pope while northern lands, except Scotland, accepted Urban. The situation was intolerable from every point of view, and the discontent was widely extended when both curial systems made it their object to secure revenues and financial resources equal in amount to those of an undivided Church.

As both the lines of succession were continued after the deaths of the first two rival popes, the University of Paris, because of its weight as a centre of theological learning, began to act as the receiving point for protests from every country, and then through its famous teachers, D'Ailly, Gerson and Conrad, set to work to provide a remedy. Three courses were suggested: the voluntary abdication of the two competitors, arbitration, and a general council. It was resolved to try all three in succession, the first proposal being regarded as the simplest. The Avignon pope refused to abdicate, though his Roman rival proved more conciliatory. In 1394 prospects of an accommodation seemed more hopeful when the cardinals at Avignon, when about to proceed to a new election, agreed that, one and all, they would work for a restoration of unity. Their influence was not sufficient, for their nominee, Benedict XIII, refused from the time of his election to that of his death, a period of thirty years, to make any concession whatever, even when his most important supporters deserted him. The plan of a compromise was taken up, but the diplomatic moves on both sides dragged on to such length that finally a council was held at Pisa in 1409, by which both popes were deposed as heretics on the ground that they had denied the article of the Creed that expresses belief "in one holy and apostolic church."

The Conciliar Movement

After this action a conciliar pope was chosen, Alexander V, soon to be succeeded by Balthazar Cossa, an ambitious, intriguing, military and militant cardinal, who took as his papal name John XXIII. The conciliar pope was now recognized by German imperial lands, by France and England. Spain and Scotland remained faithful to the obdurate Benedict, while Naples and most of the Italian states were attached to Gregory XI, who was of the Roman succession. On his election John had agreed to work for church reform, but his apathy and untrustworthiness proved that nothing was to be hoped from his coöperation. Accordingly the Emperor Sigismund intervened so energetically that a great international council met at Constance (1418) which, acting on its own initiative, demanded the abdication of all three popes. Very strong anti-papal feeling was also manifested in the means adopted to prevent the mass of Italian members from controlling the meetings. Each nation had the same voting weight and the council was divided into four great groups, Germans, English, French, and Italians. John fled from the sessions when he saw that he was required to send in his abdication, and the council then voted that, as its authority was derived from Christ himself, the pope was bound to obey it in all matters that pertained to reform, the schism and the articles of the faith.

John was finally deposed, but, owing to the national

jealousies which followed, it was resolved, against the wishes of the English and the Germans, to proceed to an election of a new pope, before working on a programme of reform. The candidate selected, Martin V, was an Italian, Cardinal Colonna, who managed, by making use of the self-interested aims of the various countries represented in the council, to protect the existing prerogatives of the papacy. Special arrangements called Concordats were made, governing the relations between the papacy and the various national churches, so prepared that the demands of the secular governments were satisfied, particularly in regard to the exercise of patronage, papal taxation, indulgences, and appeals, with the result that an effective block was raised against any general measures of church reform. The actual reforming decrees were superficial and partial; only a few abuses were removed; for example, limitations were placed on the pope's right to name cardinals, on the practice of reservations, and appeals, but the annates still continued on, and most of the reforms were to be continued only five years and their renewal was made dependent upon the will of the pope. The only effective check upon papal power was a provision for the regular calling of a general council.

Wyclif

Many of the sessions of the meeting at Constance were devoted to the subject of heresy, as it was represented in the teaching of Huss, the Bohemian disciple

of Wyclif, the English reformer, whose position must be briefly described. During the Avignon papacy, with its French tendencies, there had arisen in England a strong anti-papal sentiment which expressed itself in various parliamentary acts, all intended to affect the financial resources of the Curia. The statute of Provisors forbade the acceptance of papal "provisions" (1343-1365), restricted questions of patronage to the king's courts, while the statutes of "præmunire" (1343-1365) threatened severe penalties on any who acted contrary to the above statutes, and stated that places "provided" by the pope should be filled by royal nominees at the same time. The papal tax in 1366, which had been imposed as a result of John's acceptance of his crown as liegeman of the pope, was ordered by parliament to be abolished forever.

While the central organization of the Church was menaced by these measures, there arose as well a strong anti-clerical movement against the national Church itself. The old alliance between the barons and the hierarchy had been broken because of the constant extension of jurisdiction on the part of the ecclesiastical courts. Moreover, the long war with France had brought with it much financial distress, and it was felt that the Church, which owned from one fourth to one third of all the land in England, should be made to pay its share of taxation. Even more radical were the proposals in the parliament of 1375-1376, when complete secularization was contemplated.

The most affective champion of the anti-clerical programme was John Wyclif, a teacher at Oxford and priest of Lutterworth, one of the best livings in the diocese. In a mass of writings Wyclif attacked the abuses of the clergy and gave a scholastic basis to the anti-papal and anti-clerical campaign. His principal argumentative points were directed against ownership of landed property by the Church and the appeal to any other authority than that of the Old and New Testament. The Church, he contended, was corrupt, while the real kingdom of God was the mystical body of the Elect. Owing to the systematic violation by the clergy of the apostolic precepts of poverty as a rule of conduct, they were to be regarded as disloyal vassals of God's law and should therefore, as felons and as guilty of mortal sin, be deprived by the civil authorities of their privileged position.

All attempts to bring Wyclif to recant before ecclesiastical tribunals failed through the intervention of his powerful friends among the nobility and the middle classes. Before his death in 1384, Wyclif had translated the Bible into English, had conducted an able and bitter polemic against the papacy, which he contended was unscriptural, and criticised the mendicant orders and the popular religious customs and beliefs of his day. He arranged also for the extension of his propaganda by establishing bands of "Poor Priests", popularly called Lollards. The chief propositions in Wyclif's teaching were formally condemned by a provincial council in

1382, but no assistance was given by the State in carrying out its mandates. It was not till a change of dynasty, by the accession of Henry IV, that active measures were taken against Lollardy through the introduction into England of the whole continental machinery of the inquisition in the famous parliamentary statute, *De Comburendo Hæretico.*

Huss

The passage of Wyclif's teaching from England to Bohemia was facilitated by a marriage between the royal families of both countries. Wyclif's work became known at the University of Prague where John Huss was a lecturer. His adoption of a part of Wyclif's view, added to the fact that he was an earnest upholder of the rights of Czech naturalism against the Germans, brought Huss into conflict with the civil and ecclesiastical authorities of his own land. Tumultuous outbreaks were frequent in Prague as a result of Huss's powerful indictments against the abuses of the papal system, indulgences and the like. Inspired by a sincere belief in the justice of his cause, Huss was induced to accept a safe conduct to the Council of Constance, which he hoped, because of its attitude towards the papacy, to bring over to his position. Here, after a trial which was but a travesty of justice, Huss was condemned and burnt as a heretic on charges which specifically concerned his teaching on the authority of tradition and the sovereignty of the pope (July 6, 1415). This execution

was soon followed by that of Huss's disciple Jerome, whose abjuration did not save him from the vindictive persecution of the members of the council. Probably in both cases there was a willingness to make an example of the Hussites, in order to convince public opinion that the general attitude of the council towards the papacy, in spite of its drastic dealing with individual popes, was thoroughly orthodox.

The Council of Basel

Though provision had been made, as we have mentioned, for the regular calling of councils, it was not until 1431, at Basel, after a premature attempt had been made at Pavia in 1421, that another great international synod was summoned to meet. The subjects on the official agenda were church reform, the extirpation of the Hussite movement, which by this time had virtually created a religious revolution in Bohemia, and reunion with the Eastern Church. Some progress was made with the Bohemian difficulty. When the council began its work of reform and passed measures to reduce the pope to the position of a purely administrative official, Eugenius IV replied by transferring the council to Italy where the influence of Italian episcopate might be more effectively exerted. The majority of the members refused to cross the Alps and proceeded to summon the pope for his refusal to obey the council's mandate. A minority, however, went to Italy,— first to Ferrara, then to Florence,— where an act of Union was drawn up by

which the schism between East and West was supposed to be ended. At this meeting the distressing state of the beggarly fragment of the Eastern Empire caused the Greek emperor to urge his bishops to accept the terms of union, and many of the Easterns were persuaded to acknowledge papal claims on the basis of falsified extracts, made from the acts of early synods and from Greek patristic writers. While the Easterns at Florence acknowledged the validity of Western custom and doctrines and accepted papal autocracy, they were allowed to retain their liturgy, clerical marriage, and were not obliged to use the "Filioque" in the Creed (July 1439).

By this time the Council of Basel had suspended and deposed Eugenius, and a few months later another schism began in the Western Church through the election on the part of the council of Amadius of Savoy as pope, who took the title of Felix V. As the new conciliar pope secured only a moderate support among the chief European countries, the members of the council itself were divided on the subject as to who was the rightful pope. There now followed a period of active diplomacy in which Eugenius, by making large concessions to all the princely supporters of Felix on the subject of church patronage, finance and appeals, won them over, and finally his successor, Nicholas V, was relieved from all further concession of conciliar antagonism because of the forcible breaking up of the remnant of the Basel Council by the Emperor Frederick III. Felix V abdicated

and accepted the cardinalate from his rival. As to the act of union with the Greeks, it was treated as a dead letter in the East when the conquest of Constantinople showed that no real military aid against the Turk was to be expected from the nations of western Europe.

The Renaissance Papacy

Nicholas V begins the line of humanistic popes who usher in the period of the Reformation. More than one of his successors tried to revive the crusading adventure, but with no result. At the beginning of the last quarter of the fifteenth century, the papacy had sunk to the level of an Italian secular principality. The popes of this age were devoted to the task of looking out for the promotion of their relatives, concerned with the enlargement of their temporal domains, or busied with the intrigues of small Italian courts. Sometimes they were notorious examples of evil living, and even in the case of the best of them they seemed oblivious of their obligations to Christianity as a whole. The demand for reform was incessant, but as the councils had failed to secure it there appeared no chance of realizing the hopes of a change. The councils represented internationalism, while the whole movement of the age was towards nationalism. The demand for conciliar action as the solution for church difficulties was becoming as unreal as the proclamation of a crusade against the infidel.

What one nation could do by itself to set its house in order may be seen from the contents of the Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges (7th June, 1438), which established the basis for a French national Church in communion with but not dependent upon Rome, in the Hildebrandine sense. This document elaborated with legal definiteness the following points:—regular meetings of a general council; the rights of the episcopate, and of the national Church generally, in its relation with the papacy; and the emphasis on the power of the crown over the clergy in matters of finance and judicature. In Spain the process of developing royal control over the Church went even further, for the machinery of the Inquisition itself was turned over with papal consent to the crown and it became a regular part of the royal administration. All important patronage was controlled by the monarch, and no papal bull could be recognized as valid within the borders of Spain without the royal "placet". In southern Italy, when it fell under Spanish control, the claim was made that all ecclesiastical acts pertaining to the pope should be exercised by the king, and although this right was never formally acknowledged by the Curia, the Spanish system of church control was tacitly allowed.

The Trend Towards Reform

In England, after the conclusion of the civil war that devastated the country for so long in the fifteenth century, the destruction of the power of the aris-

tocracy which was one result of the war, prepared the way for monarchical absolutism, but the details of church policy could not be worked out till the next century. It is interesting to note how under a a changed atmosphere Henry VIII applied in England the system of monarchical control of the Church which the rulers of the continent had already introduced. As Germany was not a unified nation under a central executive, the extension of State control did not go on there as systematically as in Spain and France, yet the territorial sovereigns were able very considerably to limit the interference of the central machinery of the Church in their particular districts.

In spite of the Italianization of the papacy and the deliberate application of the national principle outlined above, it is a mistake to represent the close of the Middle Ages as a period in which the Church and church influence were on the decline. The appreciation of unity had been impaired but not destroyed, for it was still too deep rooted, and though the political victories of the pope had caused them to accept nothing higher than the standards of local Italian state life, the papacy itself was still a potent factor to be reckoned with in diplomacy and in religious organization. A distinction was made between the institution and the individual who wielded the power. In all projects of reform, the idea that the central organ by which the Church was directed could be neglected as an unnecessary factor was still remote, or at least

had no wide recognition. Not only were the great religious orders still active, but many had gone through a real process of revival, notably the Benedictines and the Canons Regular, especially in Germany. Efforts, consistent and effective, were made to restore the original aims of the mendicant orders. Among the men who took part in this work may be mentioned the great revivalist preacher, Vincent Ferrer, the Spanish Dominican (1357-1419), and the Franciscan Bernardino of Siena, who conducted a famous campaign against luxury in the chief towns of Italy during the period of the councils.

Savonarola and Other Reformers Within the Church

Most remarkable among all popular preachers was Savonarola (b. 1452), a Dominican, who in Florence for many years preached against corruption in Church and State. Inspired by his constant reading of the Old Testament prophecy and influenced by the Apocalyptic writings of Joachim, Savonarola clothed his own teaching in prophetical language and experienced visions in which were foreshadowed a coming reform, root and banch, both of State and Church. His own practical interpretation of these experiences was that he was bound to support French intervention in Italy and procure the expulsion of the Medici from Florence. It was not difficult from the point of view of either morals or politics to hold up Pope Alexander VI to execration, and Savonarola made good use of his

opportunity. When a papal excommunication was issued against him in 1497, no heed was paid to it either by Savonarola himself or the city authorities. Later on, as the result of political shiftings, when Florence found it useful to secure the pope as an ally, Savonarola was forbidden by the government to preach. He appealed openly to a General Council as the sole organ of reform; and, later on, when his personal enemies secured a dominant voice in the control of Florence, Savonarola and his friend Domenicho, were condemned on most questionable evidence and executed (28th May, 1498). Of an entirely distinct type from the movement led by the great Dominican monk in Florence was the current of religious enthusiasm which as an outcome of St. Bernardino's ministry of conversion passed into France. Its most attractive figure is the famous Joan of Arc, in whose unique personality there was found a remarkable combination of cool, clear-headed common sense and the convictions of a naïve mysticism. She was a great military leader and also a teacher of national righteousness in its most direct form. Her place in religious history belongs by the side of Catherine of Siena and St. Bridget of Sweden, both of whom had strongly influenced for good the political life of the preceding century. Another reforming movement is associated with the name of Gerhard Groot of Deventer (d. 1384), who on the simple basis of a few rules without vows founded a community called the Brethren of the Common Life. Asceticism,

mystical religion and the preparation of books of a religious and edifying character were the chief factor in this revival, which centred about the Low Countries and adjacent German lands. The community's name has attained a lasting renown through its association with the "Imitation of Christ", probably the work of Thomas von Kempen.

While this quietist tendency influenced at best only a few, popular devotional zeal centred chiefly on subjects that had a more direct appeal to the senses, such as reliques, rosaries, the cult of patron saints, which last was specially promoted by various brotherhoods and guilds. Equally in favor was the practice of making pilgrimages to local or international shrines, particularly where the working of miracles was promised. The extraordinary popularity of indulgences still continued unabated; since they were a source of assured income they were used by the Curia for providing for the building of the new basilica of St. Peter's in Rome. In order to create a wider field of support, the theory was developed that indulgences might, by "the papal magisterium", be extended to the benefit of the dead, though authorities were by no means clear as to the character or certainty of the benefit.

Witchcraft

Deteriorating as was the indulgence system, a far darker side of popular religion comes to the surface in the belief in witches because of the influence that belief

had in intensifying the apparently instinctive tendency in man towards religious persecution. At an earlier period the Church authorities had opposed altogether the belief in witchcraft, but by the time of Thomas Acquinas it had become formally incorporated in the mediæval dogmatic system. One begins to find mention of proceedings against witchcraft by the Inquisition in France in the thirteenth century. But the great extension of repressive measures is connected with the names of two German Dominican professors, Heinrich Institoris and Jakob Sprenger, who, at the close of the fifteenth century, secured papal approval for their campaign against witchcraft and inaugurated the first *en masse* burning of witches. As they worked out their theories and procedure in a ponderous volume, the *Malleus Maleficorum*, it was possible for them to spread the seeds of this deplorable practice, and to draw after them in the mania for witch persecution, not only popular sympathy but the coöperation of learned men and the active support of the State.

Later Scholasticism

In intellectual productivity the close of the Middle Ages is marked by the decline of scholasticism and the rise of humanism. Scholasticism, it may be said broadly (there were, be it remembered, numbers of scholastic teachers all through this period), had run its course, so far as names of the first calibre are concerned, with Duns Scotus (d. 1308) and William of

Occam (d. 1349). The first gave primacy to the Will over the Understanding. As the process of willing is absolutely free and in no way determined by the factor of the intellect, morality is placed higher than theoretical speculation. Applying this indeterminism to God, His Will cannot be adequately described in terms of dialectic; hence there may be truths which cannot be established by the reason but may be accepted on faith. Adopting this fundamental division of Scotus, Occam subjected it to a careful epistemological analysis. Ideas had, he insisted, no relation to reality and all general terms are purely arbitrary, for they do not correspond to any particular sensation. As reason cannot by its very constitution penetrate into either the sphere of the sensible or the supersensible, all articles of faith must depend on authority. Any kind of dogma might be accepted. Granting the Will of God is arbitrary, as Scotus showed, Occam's addition to this theory made it impossible to trace any rational connection between the various items of the Church's teaching.

As applied to the actual polity of State and Church, Occam's theories were as effective in destroying the existing order of mediæval life as were the teachings of the pre-revolutionary French philosophers in overturning all monarchical absolutism. The sphere of Church and State were, he said, entirely distinct, and in case of conflict, utility alone must decide. When necessary the pope might depose princes and transfer kingdoms, but as the well-being of the Church

was the supreme law, the organization of the Church could be varied to suit new conditions. Instead of a centralized Church he thought there might be a nexus of national churches. As faith was supreme in all matters connected with religion, any prince or layman, provided he had the orthodox faith, could exercise supreme control over the Church. Christ had never promised that right faith should be continued in the whole Church, or that the pope or hierarchy should endure. Christ's promise might be fulfilled if little children believed. Though a General Council was not infallible, it could sit in judgement on the pope, and in matters of faith, the faithful laity or their representatives, the princes, might be called upon to defend and preserve the Faith.

It will be seen how this powerful plea for individualism remained dormant for many decades before it became the foundation-stone of the continental reforming movement.

Humanism

However acute and radical was the last stage of scholasticism, in its most brilliant representative, Occam (who may be called the mediæval Hume), a more potent dissolvent of the accepted principles of society in Church and State was the Humanistic Movement. It is of course untrue to associate the recovery of the knowledge of ancient literature with any one century. Sylvester II, the tenth century pope, was probably in technical scholarship the equal

of many of the famous Humanists. Humanism means not merely the reading of the classics but reading them with certain presuppositions. How these presuppositions arose is more or less of a problem. Negatively, they may have been due to the widely felt pressure of papal autocracy. Unqestionably, Humanism represents the right of the laity to think and act independently of clerical control, and the laity became conscious of these rights when they were brought under the influence of classical literary traditions. Through these traditions the laity became acquainted in the most impressive way with a period of the world's history where the political and religious watchwords of mediæval life had no significance. The great Italian Humanist, Petrarch (1304-1374), appealed on the basis of classical culture to men's claims for self-development outside of the lines of the Church's speculative thought. In order to find the beautiful, the worthy and the interesting, the best standards of classical antiquity must be sought for; hence the enthusiasm for recovering the literary and artistic remains of the early Roman Empire which was common throughout Italy and probably through the international intercourse facilitated by the councils penetrated into northern lands.

As scholars began to be trained in the investigation of the classic past, it was natural that the principles of historical criticism should be applied to the records of the Church itself. So Laurentius Valla (1407-1457) exposed the forgery of the Constantinian Do-

nation and the pseudo-Isidorian decretals began to be suspected about the same time by Torquemada; indeed Valla did not hesitate to question whether the Apostles' Creed was of apostolic origin. Through the study of Plato, due to the Latin translation made by Ficino of Florence, the whole dialectical structure of scholastic theology lost its authoritative sanction. In its place men began to appeal to a new line of Christian thought which might be constructed, independently of church tradition, from the actual writings of St. Augustine and St. Paul. Petrarch himself pointed out the difference between the religion of the New Testament and the patristic period and that presented by Scholasticism. The prevailing tendency of Humanism was away from institutionalism towards individualism in religion, though there is no general classification possible of humanistic thought. Some of its representatives were pure classicists, interested in questions of style or in antiquarian lore; some kept their peace with the Church, while others cut themselves loose from it and were contemptuous both of religion and morality. In nothern lands the trend of humanistic teaching emphasized its educational and ethical value.

The Christian East

Brief mention must now be made of the Christian East which has only entered the limits of this chapter in connection with the councils of Ferrara and Florrence. The Tartar conquest resulted in a wide ex-

pansion of Russian Christianity both north and east, and many monasteries were built in the new lands acquired by Russian settlers. This movement is specifically marked by the transfer of the Metropolitan of Kiev (who was still named by the Patriarch of Constantinople) to Moscow in 1325, though the title of the old see was still preserved. Further advances westward were obstructed by the rise of the Polish kingdom—after the defeat of the Tartar conquerors—where Latin Christianity was acknowledged and has continued to prevail. In the countries to the east of Hungary, in Moldavia and Wallachia, there were Latin bishoprics and Franciscan missionaries in the fourteenth century, and even the shores of the Black Sea, owing to the presence there of Genoese colonies, the jurisdiction of the Roman See was extended. In the farther east, in Persia, in India, and even in China itself, the mendicant orders penetrated, and an archbishopric was founded at Pekin in 1370, only soon to disappear because of the hostility of the Keng dynasty.

While this progress was made by the Western Church, the Easterns were suffering severe and constant losses through the steady advace of the Ottoman Turks, who after covering Asia Minor passed over into Europe to conquer the new Slavonic kingdoms of the Balkan peninsula. Nothing was done to save the situation by the union compact carried through at Florence. Russia refused to accept it and declared itself free from the Patriarch of Constanti-

nople; in other Slavonic and in Greek-speaking districts the Turks, who used the Eastern Churches as a part of the local administration to control their Christian subjects, encouragement was definitely given to those who opposed union with the Latin Church.

The Hussites and Other Sects

Of the separatist movements within the Latin communion, the most active during the fifteenth century was that led by the followers of Huss, who holding fast to the principles of their founder made the giving of the chalice to the laity the visible symbol of their opposition to the Church. The custom of administration in one species, although forbidden by two popes, Urban II and Paschal II, had become general and had been justified dialectically by Thomas Acquinas and Bonaventura. Huss had made the administration of the chalice a test of faithfulness to his teaching. In the popular outbreaks which followed his death, the clergy who held to the practice withdrew to Tabor near Austi, which became the armed centre of the Hussite party. Attempts to repress them by force of arms failed because they found an able champion in Ziska, who defeated all attempts at armed repression. The Hussites soon divided into two parties, the Utraquists, who stressed the administration of the chalice but accepted the existing order of the Church, and the Taborites, who demanded radical changes in all doctrines and practices and stood

for the repression of German nationality, a step which they were prepared to take by applying precepts of Old Testament social morality to the treatment of their enemies. An attempt was made by the Council of Basel to conciliate the moderate party by allowing them to administer the chalice. As this concession was afterwards rejected by the papacy constant efforts were made to render it non-effective. In the meantime the radical wing had been almost annihilated in the battle of Lipan in 1434. A final settlement was only reached in 1511 when the Utraquist customs were allowed to continue unmolested. The permanent influence of the radical wing, shorn of its national and social aggressiveness, is seen still in the Moravian Brethren.

Of the older dissident organizations the Katharists had generally disappeared under the strict repression of the Inquisitors, except where they found a safe refuge in the northern portion of the Balkan peninsula. The Waldensian stronghold had been shifted as a result of persecution from southern France to the Germanic and Slavonic-speaking lands of the Empire, where, however, frightful measures of repression were taken against them at the close of the fifteenth century. In Italy they still continued to exist along side of other separatist groups which had taken their origin from the disturbances already noted within the Franciscan order. The most radically antagonistic of all were the Apostolic Brothers, who under the leadership of Dolcino kept up armed

resistance in the Piedmontese mountains until overwhelmed by a crusade formally directed against his partisans.

Julius II and Leo X

The sixteenth century opened auspiciously for the papacy. After the abandonment of the Hildebrandine programme, it was now confining itself to such practical policies as were possible with the growth of vigorous national states. On this level many notable achievements might be recorded. In the first place the debased moral standards of Alexander VI had not been perpetuated; the Borgia influence no longer existed, and when Julius II took up the work of extending the papal estates, he did it not to help his family, but to make the temporal power of the papacy a potent factor in the Italian peninsula, and so give it important weight in international combinations. This vigorous pontiff was both a successful general and a skilled diplomatist. When his anti-French policy had proved irresistible in the battle-field he blocked the attempt of France to reëstablish conciliar supremacy over the Curia (1512), by calling the Lateran Council to discuss under his dictatorial oversight various projects of church reform.

A milder and less strenuous age was introduced by Leo X, the scion of the great Florentine banking house of the Medici, who, while devoting himself to the æsthetic cultivation of art and literature, showed as a politician the efficacy of home training

by persuading Francis I of France to abandon the Pragmatic Sanction of 1438 with its severe checks on curial privileges. The venerable and hardly tried machinery at Rome was working regularly; no shocks or catastrophes seemed possible. "Let us enjoy the Papacy," so it is reported the genial Leo wrote to his brother Julian, "since God has conferred it upon us." There was nothing heroic in the character of the Medicean pope, and unfortunately for him he was precipitated suddenly into a crisis which required something more than Florentine cleverness and dilettante aloofness.

CHAPTER VI.

THE PERIOD OF SEPARATION AND REFORM

UNENDING questions may be raised and perhaps partially answered why the revolt against the papacy began first among the Germans and was carried by the Germans to a successful issue. Mere incidents have been entitled just and sufficient causes. The momentum that comes from great personalities is imponderable; it avoids classification, yet it may be said that the two reasons which made the German reformation succeed was first the popular moral fervor of Luther and then the fact that the papal champion was Charles V, whose chief aim was to introduce Spanish absolutism into the existing loosely knit political order of Germany. The princes of Germany, each one bent on securing real autonomy in his particular territory, and actual executive authority over it, were not inclined to tolerate in the imperial constitution more than a titular or strictly limited precedence and representative leadership on the part of the emperor. Wherever there were ecclesiastical territorial rights held by bishops or archbishops, the tendency was to dissolve them or to make them subordinate to the civil principalities.

Economically, German city life was experiencing an unusual degree of prosperity; trade was active,

education was diffused as is shown by the enormous increase of printed books, by the popularity of book fairs, by the attention paid to the development of art. Sources of social unrest were also present in the class of Imperial Knights who were heavily indebted to the capitalistic classes of the towns, and lived by extortion and violence. Dangerous in its possibilities, too, was the discontent of the peasants, who in a period of rising prices, owing to the discovery of the great silver mines in America, felt the pressure of feudal dues, and were bitterly antagonistic towards the great landed estates held by monastic and other religious corporations; they did not hesitate, too, to criticise the clergy themselves for their idleness and their failure to adhere to more rigid standards of life. Everywhere the aspiration for religious reform was associated with the expectation of social revolution.

Erasmus

Probably the most powerful single influence on educated opinion in Germany at this time was the humanist Erasmus (born near Rotterdam in 1466), who, along with unique gifts in scholarship, was thoroughly in earnest in his belief that all learning should be used as the means and basis for the moral upbuilding of the nation and the individual. Ignorance he took to be the chief opponent of sincere Christianity, because without it one could not properly appreciate the uncorrupted sources of truth in the New Testament and in the Fathers. In 1516 he

published the first edition of the Greek New Testament. He was indefatigable as a writer of healthy, vigorous Christian pamphlets intended to train up an ethically alert laity. Of the institutionalism of the existing mediæval Church where it failed to effect conduct or where it actually prevented sincere religious convictions, he was an unsparing critic and used his ready wit and his wide scholarship to make it ridiculous. His satires on the foibles of the clergy and on the obscurantism of the monastic orders were read by all classes, not excepting those against whom they were directed. As a dictator in literature and a guide in enlightened morality, thoroughly Christian in tone, and because of the simplicity of its dogmatic groundwork, not perplexing in its method, Erasmus addressed an international audience.

Especially was he popular in those German universities, where in the conflict between the old (scholastic) and the new (humanistic) learning the authority of his name was powerful in promoting the systematic study of the ancient languages. Erasmus enjoyed being in the favor of the great and powerful, whether they were found among highly placed clerics or in princely families. In these friendships, as his correspondence shows, he was apt to be undiscriminating; the existing social order was the medium in which he preferred to work and he had all the horror of Burke at the idea of catastrophic change as a method of reforming the abuses he was lashing with his satire. Under Erasmus's direction, regulated and orderly

progress towards the attainment of his religious and ecclesiastical ideals through a church organization in the hands of educated, trained and broad-minded leaders, seemed to his friends and admirers not beyond the bounds of reasonable assurance. If the responsible classes could be educated, then transformation would spell reformation.

Luther

Such was the atmosphere of optimism that was roughly dissipated when Martin Luther came into public notice by his attacks on papal indulgences through the publication of his famous ninety-five theses at the University of Wittenberg. Born in 1483 of a sturdy peasant stock, Luther, after studying at Erfurt, entered the Augustinian order, but the strictest monastic discipline failed to satisfy his religious needs. After much trying self-analysis, tested as it was by study of the New Testament and of St. Augustine, he became convinced that the keystone of religion was faith. Nothing else counted; man by himself and in himself could only produce evil. The preaching of the indulgence system by the Dominican Tetzel, who with others was commissioned to procure funds for the rebuilding of St. Peter's, stirred Luther to state his convictions as to the real conditions of God's forgiveness. This he did in full detail; no place was left for papal action in the relation of the soul to God except a bare declaration, officially made, that every true Christian,

without the formal certificate of indulgence had an actual share, whether in life or in death, of the merits bestowed by Christ upon the whole community of the faithful. A lengthy controversy followed in which Luther elaborated his points and transmitted his argument to Rome. The dispute became more serious when Frederick the Wise of Saxony intervened to see that justice was done to the Wittenberg monk. Luther agreed to keep silence if his enemies abstained form attacking him, a condition which was far from being scrupulously maintained at Rome.

Leo X was chiefly concerned in persuading Frederick to withdraw from Luther his protection, for Julius II's plan to secure funds for the rebuilding of St. Peter's by the sale of indulgences had been extended in 1514 by Leo to Germany. Apart from the formal dispensation from temporal and purgatorial penalties, the indulgence was accompanied by a "confessionale", i.e., a document which authorized the holder to secure from any priest, after confession, one formal and complete absolution if he were in good health, and gave the same right if at any time the individual holding it were in peril of death. These privileges could be secured by visiting seven churches, by making prescribed prayers at each visit, with the additional condition that a sum of money be paid which might be increased if the two first conditions were not complied with. The financial side of the transaction was emphasized to a deplorable degree and it can easily be seen that to the popular mind it meant

that moral laxity might be atoned for by money payments. The "confessionale" was not the least evil part of the system; for it practically did away with the ordinary discipline which the parish priest exerted over his congregation as their regular confessor. Its terms, too, might to the ordinary intelligence not trained in the subtle distinctions of scholastic theology be interpreted as a formal licence, with the Church's approval, to live a life of sin up to the hour of death. If the indulgences could have been distributed automatically, they would probably have done less harm. The popular religious teaching received from the sellers of indulgences, who by their eloquence had to make a market for their wares, could under no conditions have been edifying.

Economic objections to the sale of indulgences undoubtedly played a part in swelling the opposition to them, especially where the government felt the difficulties due to the great drain of the precious metals carried across the Alps in the coffers of the indulgence agents. But Luther's protest against indulgences was that of a practical pastor. Though he was a university professor, lecturing on biblical subjects, his own training as a monk had kept him in touch with popular feeling, and besides from 1515 on he had acted as substitute in the parish church of Wittenberg in place of the regular parish priest who was incapacitated by illness. He saw the actual evils of the indulgence campaign, and knew, too, that many German princes had forbidden the indulgence preachers access to their

territories. More than once in his sermons during the two years of his pastoral work he had warned his people against the sale, and explained his own views. These warnings were all the more needed because the most active of all the indulgence preachers, Tetzel, was conducting his campaign not far from Wittenberg. To bring his opposition to a head and also to secure sympathetic and powerful allies, Luther drew up his nintey-five theses, which he nailed to the doors of the church at Wittenberg, October 31st, 1517. In these he merely repeated the position he had already taken that the forgiveness of sin was not a chain of successive accidental acts procured from the outside, but a transformation of self-centred human nature by a process of continuous faith, penitence, self-denial and sanctification into a God-centred nature. The only new point added by him in the theses was a development of his position on the purgatorial aspect of the indulgence doctrine.

The publication of the theses called forth many replies; naturally Tetzel entered the conflict. But more important was the fact that a curial official, Silvestro Mazolini di Prierio, came out as the champion of the indulgence system and attacked Luther as disloyal to the authority of the papacy. The same line was taken by Dr. Eck of Ingoldstadt, one of the best known of German theologians. Luther was not slow to defend himself and fully accepted in various writings the conclusions to be drawn from his theses as to papal authority. He was willing, he said, to respect

the pope as the disciplinary executive of the Church, but not as the personal repository of its teaching. In 1518 he had gone so far as to accept as his one infallible guide only the Scriptures themselves. The matter was now taken out of the sphere of theological controversialists and brought within the province of the legal machinery of the Church, when a papal officer, Mario Perusco, brought charges formally against Luther as an heretical suspect. The commission appointed to investigate the charge included among others di Prierio, who had written against Luther An interval of sixty days was given him within which he was to appear at Rome (August 7, 1518). As, however, he still continued to write in defense of his position, Cardinal Cajetan, who was to be papal legate at the diet of Augsburg, was commissioned to arrest Luther and have him dispatched to Rome.

Neither the emperor nor Luther's immediate sovereign, Frederick of Saxony, were willing to hand him over to papal agents to have the trial held outside of Germany, or allow anyone but a German bishop to preside over the trial. Luther was allowed, however, to appear before Cajetan at Augsburg for a preliminary hearing. Here, when it was called to Luther's attention that his theses were contrary to a bull of Clement VI and that he had stated that faith was a prerequisite for the reception of the sacrament, he was asked to withdraw both the theses and his supplementary declarations. Luther refused to ac-

knowledge the teaching, "magisterium", of the pope, and in a notorially executed document on the 16th of October appealed from the pope "badly informed to the pope better informed"; i.e. he asked for an investigation at the Curia "de novo" under the charge of men who had not taken sides already against him, and also for a trial in German territory. Fearing a possible seizure by Cajetan's agents, Luther escaped from Augsburg, and in November, when back at Wittenberg, appealed to a General Council. Later attempts made by the Curia either to prevent Frederick from giving protection to Luther, or to secure concessions from Luther himself, failed. All that could be extracted from him was a promise to keep silence if those who opposed his teaching would do the same.

It was soon known that Leo had in November proclaimed the indulgence teaching which Luther attacked to be the authoritative teaching of the Church. In 1519 no thought was given by either side to Luther's proposal that the subject should be dropped. Dr. Eck propounded various theses and contended that the issue involved the acceptance of papal autocracy, to which, of course, Luther was glad to reply on historical grounds, though he still accepted communion with the Roman See as an obligation of practical necessity. This was simply his old line of argument on the disciplinary rights of the central executive of the Church. At a public disputation at Leipzig, Eck was able to force Luther to allow that the Hussites condemned by the decree of Constance were

good Christians and orthodox. All the institutions of the Church,—its creeds, theology, worship, and hierarchy,—he said, were subordinate to the Gospel, under which term he meant the message of divine grace that comes completely to the human soul through the revelation in and by Christ. All ministerial acts have therefore, he stated, spiritual validity only as they are representative of a community made up of individuals who have absorbed the Gospel of grace. The official Church with all its institutions must be accepted, not as a finality, but as the organ of divine discipline and education.

Luther's courage and steadfastness, his interest in improving the educational curriculum at Wittenberg, and also the enemies he had made in the Curialist party at home and abroad, now brought to his side a host of humanist sympathizers. Artists such as Dürer, laymen of cultivation like Pirckheimer, clergy and bishops, as well as the university adherents of the New Learning, were glad to find in him a new champion of their cause. Hutten, a vigorous defender of the rights of German nationalism against the existing machinery of papal control, also began to realize the aid he would secure from Luther's campaign. Under the combination of these influences, and especially after reading Hutten's edition of Laurentius Valla's investigation of the Constantine Donation, Luther became convinced that his moderate, restrained attitude towards the papacy could no longer be held. He came to share Hutten's nation-

alistic detestation of curial government and soon revived with tremendous power in his address to the *Christian Nobility of the German Nation* the anti-papal polemic that, as we have seen, goes back in the Middle Ages to the time of Joachim di Fiore. It was this address that proclaimed the duty of the German emperor and princes to drive out curial oppression, by force if necessary, and to proceed on an independent basis to reform the Church. It made the centre of the new system the parish from whence should radiate newly originated communities, with better education, improved methods of poor relief, which would know nothing of the old traditions, practices and institutions of mediæval churchmanship. Fasts, pilgrimages, monasticism, clerical celibacy, excommunication and interdict, all were to go, and the papacy itself as a juristic organism was to disappear and be remodelled along such lines as would confer upon it purely ethical leadership. Questions of organization on a large scale had little interest for Luther, and he spoke of the reorganization of the Church in Germany as if it little mattered after all whether the episcopate was preserved or not. It might stay, but if it resisted the proposed transformation it could easily be dropped without hurt.

Shortly after this national trumpet-call to all classes in Germany to oppose the Curia, Luther issued another pamphlet entitled the *Babylonian Captivity*, in which he developed his theory of the Sacraments in harmony with his doctrine of the all-sufficiency of

faith. Three were to be retained,—Baptism, the Lord's Supper, and Penance,—but of course all three were interpreted in the light of Luther's own teaching as already given above. Next came a pamphlet on the *Freedom of a Christian Man*, written with less polemical spirit, and meant by its clear devotional language to impress upon the popular mind the constructive side of Luther's position.

Leo, being occupied in getting all the political benefit he could for the Pontifical State and for his family from the rivalry between Spain and France, was much worried in speculating on the problem as to which of these two powers would be most profitable as an ally, and therefore gave little attention to the excitement in Germany, which he regarded as a petty squabble between monastic orders. Luther's trial dragged on and it was only Dr. Eck's presence in Rome in 1520 that caused more expedition to be used. Finally, in June of this year, forty-one propositions extracted or deduced from Luther's writings were pronounced heretical, his books were forbidden and ordered to be burned and their author was given sixty days to recant, under penalty of being declared an open heretic, with the additional provision that the civil and ecclesiastical authorities should deliver him up to be taken to Rome, and that any place harboring him should be placed under an interdict. Eck and Aleander, the papal librarian, were entrusted with the publication of the bull in Germany. The method followed was most questionable because Eck, in order

to wreak his personal spite on numbers of his opponents among the German Humanists, had introduced into the body of the document the names of Hutten, Pirckheimer and others of the same group. Many bishops paid no attention to the papal document, and neither Frederick of Saxony nor the University of Wittenberg recognized its existence. Luther himself dramatically burnt the bull in Wittenberg on the 10th of December, 1520, after the order for the burning of his books had been carried out in a few places.

Though sure of local support, the situation of Luther was perilous because the attitude of the young emperor Charles V, now but twenty years old, was uncertain. According to mediæval canon law the secular power was bound to carry out the provisions of the pope's bull; i.e. Luther's books must be burnt and he and his supporters must be delivered to Rome. When the excommunication ensued the persons named became civil outlaws and they must be so treated by the state officers. Charles was known to sympathize with Humanism, and much hope was based on this sympathy. It was forgotten that the emperor was not only not a German but that German nationalism was distasteful to him because it violated the principles of absolutism on which had been built up the power of his family in Spain. Charles also would be the last one to encourage a radical break with the Church, since the mainstay of his control over both Spain and southern Italy were the clergy.

Both by policy and by temperament the emperor might be counted upon to side with the ecclesiastical authorities. Yet he had no intention of yielding himself up as the blind instrument of Leo's will, especially as he knew the pope was now inclining towards a pro-French policy in Italian politics.

When the papal legate demanded that the emperor should put into execution the terms of the bull, Charles refused and took the middle course of citing Luther to appear before the great representative body of Germany, the Diet, which met this year (1521) at Worms. Luther appeared and refused to retract any of his doctrines except on the authority of the Scriptures. As to his famous declaration at the close of his speech to the Diet, the only authenticated words are "God help me, Amen." Not long after this he was placed under the ban of the Empire, which meant that he was now an outlaw. According to the terms of the safe conduct under which he had made the trip to Worms, he was to return home in the charge of an imperial herald. On his way back he was spirited away by the agents of the Elector of Saxony and disappeared from public ken. This was the period he passed at the Wartburg, his patron's castle, a time of retirement which lasted nearly a year, spent in the preparation of a fresh translation into German of the New Testament. His work really amounted to the creation of a classic, for Luther selected as his medium an existing common form of written speech

which, moulded by his genius, became a general standard everywhere.

The Lutheran movement was not arrested by its leader's retirement. His disciples were especially strong in the Imperial Cities; as yet the great territorial princes were watching. Their attitude was well expressed at the Diet of Nürnberg when it was decided to adjourn the execution of the Edict of Worms until a General Council had examined the Lutheran case. A war with France was absorbing the attention of Charles V, and during his brother Ferdinand's regency in Germany the religious problem was shelved. Neither were the German princes willing to strengthen the emperor's hands. Hadrian VI, the new pope, despite his desire to rid the Church of abuses, was intolerant of the movement in Germany. So the breach between the two sides increased more and more. Popular agitators and religious enthusiasts began to see in the movement a chance for social revolution or radical change. At Wittenberg itself Karlstadt, one of Luther's followers, demanded that the monasteries be suppressed and was encouraging the populace to pillage the churches. In other places exalted visionaries clamored for the suppression of infant baptism, while they attacked universities and depreciated the value of all human science.

The situation was felt to be so dangerous that Luther returned to Wittenberg to take charge of the reforming movement, for he saw with his keen com-

mon sense that the success of the radical element would deprive him of the backing of the civil authorities, his one great bulwark materially against the Roman Curia. While the radicals represented by Karlstadt and Münzer parted company with Luther, many of the Humanists, including Erasmus himself, in their alarm at the prospect of social revolution, also broke with him. The chance for a peaceful solution disappeared when the Imperial Knights attacked the territory of the ecclesiastical Elector of Trier, but the cities refused to join them, and Ulrich von Hutten's hopes of overturning the traditional constitution of the Empire were blighted. Soon afterwards, stirred to the breaking point by social grievances, the peasants in many parts of Germany initiated a vast and violent movement against the landlords. Along with their demands for agrarian reform there were religious items in their platform obviously suggested by Luther's teaching.

Luther himself refused to be drawn either to take sides with the Knights or to encourage the Peasant Revolt and even declined to urge milder methods than those used in the ruthless repression which followed. By strictly avoiding the paths which might make him appear the champion of revolution, Luther attached to his side two of the ablest of the German princes, John of Saxony and Philip of Hesse, both of whom found in the new teaching a rallying point against imperial aggressions. The decree of Worms was now a dead letter, for the emperor was having trouble in

Italy, where those who rejected his authority were being encouraged to revolt by the new pope, Clement VII (1523-1534). While the movement was spreading, the definite lines of the Lutheran reform were being made clear: the closing of the monasteries, the emphasis on preaching, the secularization of church property and the disappearance of the episcopate. As to public worship, the custom was to keep the service of the Mass, but with the omission of the Canon; no objection was felt to the word itself which was retained. After Luther's experience with the Peasant Revolt and the rise of Anabaptism an alliance with the state authorities was affected, permanent in character and effective in method, which left a conservative stamp on Lutheranism.

Partly because of the emperor's unfriendliness to Clement VII and partly because of the situation of international politics, the exact attitude of the German imperial system to the new revolution was not defined until the Diet of Speyer (1529), when it was made plain that those states which had carried out the Edict of Worms could continue to do so, while all other states were to be prohibited form making further changes until the calling of a General Council; the Mass was allowed everywhere according to the old rite. These directions were opposed by fourteen Imperial Cities, and five secular princes and their presentation of a formal protest gave rise to the word "protestant" as a current and convenient label for this group. In order to make their opposition

effective, Philip of Hesse attempted to unite the reforming parties of both Germany and Switzerland, a project which was shattered because of the existence of divergent views on the subject of the Eucharist. At Augsburg, when it was seen that the Lutherans were inflexibly opposed to proceeding along the lines of Swiss reform, efforts were made—after Melancthon, Luther's expert theologian and a Humanist, had prepared a moderate statement of the Lutheran position (Augsburg Confession)—to discover a *modus vivendi* between the adherents of Luther and those who retained communion with Rome (1530).

Luther, however, used his powerful influence against any compromise. "I am opposed", he said at the outset, "to make the two doctrines agree; for the thing is impossible except on condition that the pope abolish the papacy." The situation was complicated by the fact that some of the cities represented at the Diet had prepared a statement accepting the Swiss tenets. On the 19th of November, 1530, an imperial edict was issued ordering the rigid application of the Edict of Worms, directing the reëstablishment everywhere of episcopal jurisdiction and providing for the restoration of all confiscated ecclesiastical property to its original owners. A strong league was formed to resist the application of these measures—the so-called league of Schmalkald, which was joined by various states that had no sympathy with Reform, but which were alarmed by the possible extension of absolutism in the hands of the emperor. Charles V,

bowing to necessity, came to terms with the Protestant princes and agreed to leave things as they were. The project of a General Council was debated but no effective steps were taken by Charles to call it when he visited Clement VII at Bologna (1532-33).

In the meantime the wave of reform was gaining strength, though in Westphalia much discredit came to the reformers through the excesses practised there by the radical Anabaptists under John of Leyden, who attempted to realize a terrestrial millenium at Münster. Yet hope had not been abandoned that the religious divisions might be healed; this was all the more necessary because of the constant danger from the Turks on the eastern frontier. Many joint discussions were arranged for and in some points agreement was reached, but Luther himself never encouraged reunion, although on more than one occasion he spoke in most moderate terms of his former associates. His influence was still predominant, although his decision to allow Philip of Hesse to practise bigamy exposed him to much natural criticism, more especially as Philip became lukewarm in supporting the reforming cause. In the midst of this confused situation Luther died (1546).

Soon after a war broke out in which some of the Protestant princes supported the imperial side, and the struggle proved disastrous to the Protestant party. In 1548, in expectation of the fulfilment of the promise made by the Protestants that they would take part in a General Council, an "interim" arrange-

ment was made by which the old worship was restored while clerical marriage and the administration of the chalice were permitted. The objection against this compromise was general; therefore no permanent settlement was secured. Separation had already gone too far, and the claims of partisanship were now accepted as the correct standard of religious allegiance. The terms of the Interim were suspected of being merely an underhand plan to reintroduce by degrees the whole of the traditional papal system. Where the imperial edict was observed the Lutheran clergy preferred persecution or exile rather than submit.

The political situation, also, soon destroyed all hope of reëstablishing religious peace after the announcement of Charles V's purpose to have his son Philip II, a morose and bigoted Spaniard, succeed him as German emperor. The princes detested the project, and the most direct way of showing their detestation was to block the emperor's plans, both political and religious. Maurice of Saxony suddenly appeared as the leader of the disaffected states, and Charles, who was at this crisis not even supported by the German Roman Catholics, was obliged to consent to the peace of Augsburg (1555), by which Germany was divided into two authorized religious groups,— i.e. states which were to accept the Lutheran Confession of Faith, while others adhered to the Roman Communion. The subject was bound to follow the religious profession of the lord of the territory where

he lived; those who objected had the choice of exile. The treaty forbade further propaganda of reform, a clause which naturally displeased the Protestants, who were further annoyed by another provision by which any bishop who embraced Protestantism was obliged to abandon all claims over the property of his see.

Zwingli

Contemporary with the Lutheran movement, there arose in the Swiss Cantons, an independent anti-papal revolt in which, just as in Germany, the lines of reform are inextricably mingled with the demand for national autonomy. The oligarchical leaders in Switzerland who were exploiting their country by making degrading alliances with the more powerful European states found themselves confronted by a patriotic uprising, in which the religious element supplied a strong stimulus to common action. The champion of the new movement was Zwingli, a Swiss of Zurich, born in 1484, who after careful humanistic training became in 1518, on account of his recognized oratorical power, city preacher in the parish church of Zurich. His enthusiastic appeals in behalf of cultivating a self-respecting and devoted patriotism, by which his fellow countrymen would be inspired to give up the practice of serving as mercenaries of foreign powers, introduced his preaching of religious reform. Foreign service, he told his hearers, only encouraged ambition and luxury; the sole fruits it

produced were bad ones; "revolt against lawful authoritiy, evil habits and the pauperization of the masses."

Shortly after Zwingli took this firm stand there appeared in Zurich an Italian monk, busied with the sale of indulgences. The coincidence was not fortuitous; this evil practice in the eyes of a preacher of nationalism was only another sign of the apathetic attitude of his countrymen in submiting to foreign intervention. Zwingli, now taking up the anti-papal campaign with fervor, attacked the custom of fasting the use of images, and the mediæval doctrine of the Eucharist. He was eagerly listened to and his words produced an outbreak of popular iconoclasm. Zurich's example was followed elsewhere, especially in the cities. By 1528 more than half of Switzerland had accepted the new order. Seven cantons, the agricultural ones, remained faithful to the old religion.

Zwingli's success in other Swiss communities spurred him on to engage in a campaign of propaganda in the conservatively minded cantons. One of his disciples was arrested, brought to Schwyz and there burned for heresy in May, 1529. The result was the outbreak of a civil war. Both sides appealed to outside alliances — the Roman Catholics sought the aid of Austria and the dukes of Savoy and Lorraine; Zwingli asked the people of Berne to help Zurich, but they proved reluctant to take up the cause of reform, although they promised to side with the

people of Zurich if their territory were attacked. Attempts were now made to conciliate the opposing sides, which brought about the treaty of Cappel (June, 1529). Both Reformers and Roman Catholics, it was agreed, should not be required to abjure their respective faiths; in each parish, so it was arranged, the majority should decide. Those who were not satisfied might migrate to some other parish. Each canton was to settle the Confession to which they should adhere and there was to be no toleration of dissenters on either side. Zwingli was not satisfied, for he wished to bring Switzerland into the main current of the reforming movement. He therefore entered into relation with the German Protestants, made friends with Philip of Hesse and prepared to act in harmony with Luther after the second Diet of Speyer.

In order to facilitate this plan of common action, Zwingli proposed to discuss with the German reforming leader the point on which they disagreed. An interview took place between the two at Marburg on the 2nd of October, 1529, which showed how far the two men stood apart. Zwingli's views on the Eucharist were looked upon by Luther as purely rationalistic. The Swiss reformer denied the Real Presence, and held that the Communion was no more than a bare commemoration of the death of Christ. Efforts to effect a compromise proved futile; Luther appealed to the text of Scripture and refused to treat Zwingli as a friend and ally.

On his return to Zurich, Zwingli set to work to carry out his projects of reform in a high-handed manner without considering either the political tradition of the Swiss cantons or the religious convictions of those from whom he differed. He made himself responsible for a scheme by which the reforming cantons, and even the separate communities in Roman Catholic cantons where the reformers were in a majority, would secure a predominant voice in the administration of the government. His extreme programme alienated, therefore, many of his supporters; the people of Bern and Basel held aloof, while the Roman Catholic cantons prepared to defend themselves against the aggression of Zurich. In the conflict that followed, the fellow townsmen of Zwingli were disastrously defeated at Cappel (1531), and Zwingli himself, who had accompanied the army as chaplain, lost his life.

Calvin

The further progress of Swiss religious changes is intimately connected after the death of Zwingli with the career of John Calvin, who, because of the result of the unfavorable attitude of the French government to the teaching of the Reformers, found in Switzerland a favorable opportunity for taking up the work which Zwingli had left unfinished. The early years of preparation for the subsequent dominating position of this remarkable man must now be narrated. John Calvin, born in 1509, was the son of an official con-

nected with the French see of Noyon. He was carefully trained for a legal career and enjoyed for a time the income of two ecclesiastical benefices. Calvin came under the influence of reforming teaching at about the age of twenty-six through his association with Lefevre d'Etaples, who translated the New Testament into French and afterwards, because of his known sympathies with the German reformers, was obliged to take refuge in Strassburg to escape the persecution initiated by the doctors of the Sorbonne against those who were promulgating in Farnce the teachings of Luther. Calvin resigned his church emoluments, was imprisoned as an heretical suspect, and after being released took refuge at Basel. Here he wrote his celebrated work, *Christian Institutions*, and summed up in a dedicatory letter to Francis I, the king of France, his famous apology for the reforming doctrine. The chief points of his résumé were the exclusive authority of the Scriptures, mediation solely through Jesus Christ, justification by faith, predestination and a criticism of all the traditional principles of public worship.

Returning to France for a brief period, after spending a short time at the court of Ferrara where he found support from the favor of the duchess, a French princess, Calvin took up his residence at Strassburg, where at this time a system of religious conciliation was being effectively carried out. Both Roman Catholics and Protestants were tolerated, and even the bishop of the city took the lead in securing

for those who adopted the Protestant Confession the admission to the city of John Sturm, a recognized champion of the new doctrine. After becoming acquainted with the theological point of view of the Strassburg school, Calvin journeyed toward Neuchatel in order to visit a relation of his who had just published a complete Bible in French. From here he went to Geneva, where through the help of the people of Berne the citizens had succeeded in emancipating themselves from episcopal control (1533). By achieving their independence they gave an opportunity for the entrance among them of the new teaching as championed by William Farel, who succeeded in inducing the magistrates of the town to give up the celebration of the Latin Mass (1530). Farel regarded the advent of Calvin as a providential event, and adjured him to abandon his plan of seeking studious retirement for a life of active service amid favorable surroundings. The invitation was accepted, and soon Calvin found himself an accredited theological teacher. He was then asked to draw up a series of ecclesiastical and disciplinary measures for the new religious community; he represented the Geneva reformers in various doctrinal conferences, and was placed in charge of one of the chief churches of Geneva. Calvin had no thought, however, of confining himself to parochial activities. It was not a case, to use his own words, of "reposing after he had preached." He desired to work for the disciplinary reform of the whole community, an object not

so difficult of attainment, as Geneva was now an entirely autonomous community. At a time not long before Calvin's appearance the city was a frequented commercial centre and the goal of pleasure seekers, who came to enjoy the free life of a lax and kindly episcopal ruler in a place where the atmosphere was half French and half Italian. Even before Calvin set out to turn the town into an object lesson of "social perfection", Farel had introduced measures restricting dancing, gambling, drunkenness, luxurious display and dress. These various regulations were codified and turned into a religious "magna charta" to be imposed upon every citizen. Ignorance could not be pled as extenuation for contravention of the new law, for copies of the code were distributed in every household. Despite some protests, the communal council formally accepted the new confession of faith (29th July, 1537). It was not long, however, before a reaction set in; new elections gave the moderate party the majority in the year after Calvin's initial victory, with the result that both the reforming champions were banished from the city.

The contest of the political factions in the city, during the course of which Calvin's adversaries were accused of sacrificing their municipal independence in their desire to secure an alliance with Berne, led to the return to power of the reformers, who again summoned Calvin to take charge of the religious policy of the city (September, 1541). This time, in order to make his position secure, he had laid down as the

condition of his return the organization of a Consistory for putting his system of discipline into practice. This body met every week and exercised inquisitorial power into the conduct of all citizens. No one was exempt; old women were penalized for lighting candles or saying litanies; young men who deserted their fiancées were punished, and merchants who sold their grain too dear were summoned before this redoubtable body. Inexorable as the system was, and complete as appears Calvin's control of the ecclesiastical machinery, he was not infrequently, owing to the democratic spirit of Geneva, perilously near seeing his whole structure crumble to pieces.

Many refugees, too, came to Geneva who gave Calvin trouble. One, Bolsec, was imprisoned and banished for denying Predestination; another much more celebrated, Michael Servetus, a writer given to pantheistic speculations, was put to death under circumstances which closely involved Calvin as an accomplice of the officials of the Roman Inquisition in exposing this unfortunate man to the certain issue of a heresy trial (1553). This action was not allowed to pass without much criticism from the great Reformer's own contemporaries — mostly Protestant Humanists who appealed against him to the principles of religious toleration. After Servetus's death, but entirely unconnected with it, Calvin found it necessary to suppress a revolt against his authority by methods which show the dictatorial tendencies of his rule. Calvin's doctrine of Predestination was

much objected to by his neighbors in Berne; orders were issued to prevent the teaching by the Bernese clergy of Calvinism, and his books were directed to be burnt. Fearful of the influence of this opposition in his own city, Calvin took steps to pack the Council of Geneva with partisans devoted to his own cause. Those who opposed him were subjected to torture, some were exiled and two were executed at Geneva, one of them being subjected to this etxreme penalty "for having spoken evil of Predestination and of the justice which was done to Servetus" (1555).

Calvin's victory was complete; all efforts made by the government of Berne to secure milder treatment for Calvin's adversaries, who were designated "Libertines", proved unavailing. From this time the international position of the great dictator was secure. He no longer belonged exclusively to Geneva; his advice was asked for and followed in other countries by men who looked up to him as having the final word to say wherever the agitation for the reforming doctrines was being actively pressed. The leadership in this work of propaganda had passed definitely to Calvin; even in Germany Calvinism won conquests hitherto not achieved by Luther's followers. With indefatigable energy he continued on, in spite of infeebled health, the task to which he had devoted himself. At the date of his death, which took place May 27, 1564, the foundation had been firmly laid for those various Reformed communions, which to-day still hold him in reverence as their founder, although

they may have drifted far from the items of religious speculation which to his mind were the essentials of Christian orthodoxy.

Apart from the political environment offered by the autonomous communities of the Swiss people it is not likely that the theological systems of either Zwingli or Calvin would have secured protection. Of the two leaders, Zwingli represents the most emphatic break with historical Christianity. He made a relentless use of the critical methods of humanism in which he had been trained and aided by his sympathy with Stoicism and with Renaissance Platonism, represented by Pico, he had worked out a theory of purely subjective religion which foreshadows many of the tendencies of modern religious thought. Calvin was far more under the influence of scholastic theology than Zwingli. The majesty and omnipotence of God was made the centre of a closely rivetted doctrinal system. His ideal of God's kingdom was taken from the Old Testament rather than from the Gospel. The Scriptures, as a whole, were given the position of an inflexible code of law, and the Christian community was expected to put this code into operation by force on those who did not willingly receive it. Only by strenuous discipline could the faithful themselves be kept up to the standards of theocratic rule. No mediæval monastery could be more strictly organized and controlled than the town over which Calvin ruled. While Zwingli was content to look up to the State as the ally and supporter of his reli-

gious principles, in Calvin's view the State could only be treated as endurable in so far as it carried out the mission assigned to it by the Church.

The Anglican Reformation

At the sacrifice of chronological sequence, we have given an outline of the three great leaders of the religious revolution of the sixteenth century. In other countries the transition from the old to the new was accomplished under different conditions, although nowhere can the influence of the champions of the Continental Reformation in Germany and Switzerland be neglected or minimized. In no country is it so difficult to trace the complexities of this revolutionary era as in England. Although elsewhere historical reseach has attained practically acknowledged results, the cause of the English Reformation is still an object of heated debate. Amid the intricacies of details involving law, doctrine and personal character, it is not easy to keep a well-balanced position. Many mistakes, it must be said, have arisen because of the tendency to isolate English conditions, and one is too often tempted to read to-day into the past elements supposedly peculiar to national character which, though they may have existed before in germ, were only developed to full potency by the happenings of the Tudor period itself.

It is frequently the fashion to insist that the spread of education is enough to explain the readiness of the English nation to throw off the yoke of the

Roman Curia. Too much emphasis had been placed on the influence of Humanism in preparing the way for the coming changes. This is only natural and no one need to-day apologize for respect shown to such men as Sir Thomas More and Colet, who, with the whole group of the so-called Oxford reformers, accepted in an independent way the leadership of Erasmus. To such a type of mind there was nothing attractive in any kind of revolution, and it must be frankly said that it is unjust to suggest that the illegalities and violence of the Tudor method of reform can be traced back to the English humanists. In one way the appeal of Colet for a Church which recognized its primary moral mission to the masses of the people must have been especially impressive, because he had little faith in mere machinery. In so far then he was anti-papal, but one and all the English humanists had no love for restoring Christianity by promoting division. The actual direction of religious reform fell into different hands. It was engineered by a combination of shrewd politicians and indefatigable partisans without any of that care for logical consistency which distinguished Calvin, and its stages are not illuminated by the splendid, if unbalanced, moral and spiritual fervor of Luther. In some ways the result, which was in no way the product of genius, achieved an unexpected success. The religious settlement which seemed especially built to unsettle and dissatisfy became an object of national pride. Its authors, second-rate men as they mostly

were, not endowed with the qualities which make for heroism, built better than they knew. They also did not know what valuable coöperation they would receive from the See of Rome, whose whole dealing with the religious situation in England revealed an incredible amount of blundering incompetency.

Yet with all these favoring factors in behalf of religious revolution, the driving power came from the Tudor monarchy. It is purposeless to ask if the policy adopted by England's rulers was popular; no one thought of applying the "referendum" standard in the sixteenth century, and interesting as it would be there is little use to-day in trying to speculate as to how many people in Edward VI's time preferred the Roman to the Anglican Mass. It is easier to answer this question later on at the close of Elizabeth's reign, for the land had then been threatened by the Spanish Armada.

For the immediate genesis of the Anglican reformation one must look to the personal will of Henry VIII, a ruler who understood the art of government, although his ideals were often unworthy and his acts tyrannical. He aimed at absolutism, and he made it to the interest of certain classes of his subjects to secure what their ruler desired. In selecting the men to carry out this scheme, Henry showed keen insight into personal capacity. No better servant in diplomacy could have been selected than Cardinal Wolsey when diplomacy was needed; and when another age was ushered in with new needs, other men equally

efficient for the work the king set them to do, Cromwell and Cranmer were secured.

Apologists and advocates have been busy in exculpating or blaming the king for his desire to secure a divorce from Queen Catherine. This question has been debated too much from a point of view influenced by the long and complicated train of incidents which developed from the divorce. We know that matrimonial cases of this kind were not matters decided at Rome by ethical appeals. The Curia was avowedly opportunistic in its actions. Henry's case was only unique because there were not often matrimonial cases which involved the aunt of an emperor and the daughter of a king of Spain. It is useless to try to discover serious moral grounds either in the pope's refusal to give Henry permission to marry Anne Bullen, or in the monarch's searchings of conscience in regard to the lawfulness of his marriage to a deceased brother's wife. The prospects of a schism, weighty as they were, were not of a nature to terrify the king; in preceding ages there had been many cases of interruption of communion with the Roman See.

The king made sure of efficient support from the large landed proprietors of England by coupling with the parliamentary acts, which destroyed the connection with the papacy, a drastic measure by which the monasteries were dissolved and their property distributed to the upper classes. In the towns not only had the teaching of the Lollards still survived,

but also the spread of the reforming doctrines from Germany had already attained considerable proportions. In commercial centres, even where these influences did not extend, the Church was not popular; Henry, therefore, had on his side the backing of very important elements of the population. The representatives of the clergy themselves in Convocation made a ready submission and acknowledged the unlimited control of the monarch over the Church. The income and the jurisdiction hitherto possessed by the Roman See over England passed immediately into the royal hands. Only a few protested, and even among those who suffered death there were not many who perished simply because of their loyalty to the Roman system. The question that brought More to the block was a purely tyrannical test imposed on a man's private opinion regarding the legitimacy of the recent divorce proceedings. More was willing to accept as a loyal subject the new ecclesiastical legislation.

The secularization of the monastic houses was astutely and unscrupulously carried out by Thomas Cromwell, who began his work in 1535 with the suppression of the smaller communities; the larger soon followed. There were approximately twelve hundred monastic houses in England, mostly old foundations. Economically, they were not well managed, and though they had not received many benefactions since the reign of Henry IV they still owned enormous landed estates. The old scandalous gossip which had

been worked up with such success before against the Templars was all put to good use again by Cromwell's bands of disreputable agents. Even had the English monks and nuns been paragons of virtue like the citizens of More's Utopia, Cromwell's well-paid emissaries would have found ground for charges. As a matter of fact these communities were not models in any sense of the word; they were filled with commonplace individuals, not conspicuous either for virtue or vice. The time of their usefulness to society had probably passed, but those who despoiled them of their goods and defamed their characters are in need of a far larger measure of historical whitewash. Artistically judged, the destruction of monastic buildings was deplorable in its vandalism, and those responsible for the decay and ruin of these splendid monuments of Gothic art deserve to be pilloried along with the lime-burners of mediæval Rome and the debased architects who encrusted ancient Italian church edifices with rococo trimmings.

It was the king's policy to encourage no doctrinal change in the English Church after its isolation. The chief object was to establish the royal supremacy in affairs of church government, and no encouragement was given to the spread of novel doctrines or teachings from the Continent. But the alliance of conservative doctrine with radical external changes in the order and discipline of the Church could not long be maintained. As a directory and guide for public preaching Ten Articles were issued by au-

thority in 1536, which attest the influence on Archbishop Cranmer of Lutheran teaching, yet several essential earmarks of Lutheran teaching are not present in this pronouncement; even in regard to popular ceremonies and traditions the stand taken is in every way marked by moderation. Much more indicative of novelty was the publication of a translation of the Bible for congregational use. Though it is possible to discover the evidences of changes of direction in the national religious policy it lasted only a short time, for in 1539 Six Articles were issued, all firmly supporting the old system; for example, communion in one kind was defended and the severest penalties threatened against those who denied the doctrine of Transubstantiation.

Such were the principles which marked the Henrician Settlement up to the time of his death in 1547. Those who were convicted of adhering to continental innovation were burned as heretics, and the government acted with the same heartless severity towards the supporters of the old regime, fourteen of whom perished because they denied the royal supremacy as by law established. The conservative party in the Church had an able champion in the person of Bishop Gardiner of Winchester, yet Henry's personal affection for Archbishop Cranmer, who was notoriously in sympathy with German doctrinal views, maintained as primate of the Church a prelate who, if he had been in the ranks of the common people, might have perished at the stake as an heretical suspect.

In general, it is not easy to understand the religious policy of Henry's later years except in connection with the king's movements in international diplomacy and his habit of balancing one group of large landowners and nobles against another. How he subordinated the interest of his religious system to the financial needs of his government may be seen in the passage of an act in 1545 for the dissolution of charitable foundations, hospitals and free chapels. This measure was especially aimed at institutions founded by generations of benefactors for the offering of prayers for the departed, yet when it was accepted nothing had been done to discourage or discredit this practice in any of the previous doctrinal pronouncements.

The king's recognition of the need for providing popular religious instruction can be seen in the publication of the King's Primer which contained the Hours, Penitential Psalms, and other devotional material in English. In it is to be found the original form of the present Anglican Litany prepared by Archbishop Cranmer when the king desired to revive the already obsolete practice of open-air processions. In spite, too, of the rigid doctrinal conservatism of the end of the reign, Henry never withdrew the translation of the Bible, nor did he provide for the reintroduction of relics and image which had been abolished coincidently with the dissolution of the monastic houses. The royal leadership, unworthy and arbitrary as it was, was generally applauded; only once did Henry's

religious policy bring him in danger of a serious revolt (Pilgrimage of Grace, 1536).

The succession of Edward VI showed how far the will of the dead monarch had stood in the way of a more radical revolution in the national Church in the direction of the religious system which had won its way on the Continent. Many of the most distinctive features of the religious order of the previous reign were abandoned. The conservatives soon lost control; private masses were forbidden, fast days and confessions were no longer obligatory, the laws against heresy were annulled, the Six Articles given up, and communion in both kinds introduced. The next step was the abolition of all religious associations, guilds, colleges and fraternities. A further indication of the government's intention was the summoning to England of men who like Bucer and Peter Martyr were continental reformers of a moderate type. Strict measures were taken to enforce by a commission acting with rigid instruction the observance throughout the country of the new ecclesiastical policy as it affected teaching, preaching and conduct. The proscriptions dealt chiefly with the continuance of mediæval practices, such as the veneration of images, the use of the Bible in English in the services, the reading of homilies. The practical results encouraged a sympathetic attitude towards innovations of a more radical character. As the young king was in his minority, the government was in the hands first of Somerset and afterwards of

Northumberland, both allied with the land-owning oligarchy and neither of whom can be said to have had stronger personal religious convictions than Henry VIII's premier, Cromwell, who preferred Machiavelli to Luther.

While Somerset was still in power the first English Prayer Book appeared (1549), in the preparation of which Cranmer had fortunately the chief responsibility; his mastery of English diction and his painstaking liturgical sholarship have both contributed to make the English Common Prayer Book a unique and precious manual of popular devotion. But this primary place in the affection of the people it only won by degrees. At the time it was introduced it became the occasion of revolts and disturbances on the part of those who were attached to the superceded Service; a situation that gave Edward's government much concern and led to a series of sanguinary repressive measures in which foreign mercenaries had to be employed. From the point of view of later editions of the Prayer Book, this first book of Edward VI's is distinguished by its conservatism; on almost every crucial point respect for the Catholic past is clearly in evidence, and the greatest care was taken to preserve strict doctrinal continuity with the earliest age of the universal Church.

It seems strange that the stage now reached in innovation was not satisfactory. Popular approval or disapproval, of course, counted for little; but even allowing for the arbitrary methods of an oligarchy,

it is not easy to discern why Northumberland, who succeeded Somerset as Protector, placed himself in the hands of the radical wing of reformers, though their numbers were now materially reinforced by a group of foreigners who had been trained in Switzerland either under Calvinistic or Zwinglian influence. The conservative party saw its leaders in the episcopate dispossessed and their places taken by extremists of Bishop Hooper's type, whose aims were guided by a strenuous antagonism to the Prayer Book. Bishop Ridley of London inaugurated soon a crusade against stone altars in 1550 and steps were then taken to bring the Prayer Book into harmony with the new current in theological sympathies.

The changes made in the Book of 1552 attest the predominance of the Swiss type of reform. This does not at all mean that this revised Prayer Book would have satisfied Geneva or Berne. What happened was the abandonment of some of the conservative features of the previous volume, accomplished under pressure from men who held Swiss reform as the only goal of all innovation. Many historic ceremonies were abandoned; the Communion Office was defaced and the bare ceremonial or absence of ceremonial so dear to the Swiss reforming theorists became the norm of public worship. Coincident with the publication of this book there appeared Forty-two Articles in which the doctrinal standards of the revising leaders were set forth, but the collection bears the impress of Cranmer's influence. Impressionable

as he was, the extreme statements of the Calvinistic formularies are softened down, and sometimes combined with expressions and definitions reflecting other and not infrequently antagonistic points of view.

Before, however, either Articles or Prayer Book were put in force, the young king, who had a precocious mental development and a weak physique, died (July 5, 1553). The succession of his elder sister Mary, who had always been opposed to her frather's ideals of church government and had been harshly used during her brother's reign because of her fidelity to her convictions, immediately caused a reaction. A persistent effort was made to bring back the whole kingdom under papal rule. Parliament easily reversed the legislation on which Henry VIII's church polity depended. The group of reformers, moderate as well as radical, found themselves immediately out of favor. The stand taken by the queen was accentuated by her marriage with Philip II of Spain, who was known as a fanatical opponent of any innovation in doctrine or practice. His axiom was "not reign at all rather than reign over heretics." A policy of "thorough" was soon put into force. Cardinal Pole was admitted into the country as papal legate and the kingdom was solemnly reconciled to the Roman obedience.

Yet with the disappearance of all of Henry's ecclesiastical legislation from the statute book the restoration of monastic lands was not attempted, and in this way the support of the landed aristocracy was

secured. With this asset, and probably because of the success of the government in repressing all movements to select rival sovereigns faithful to the reforming interest, a step was taken to promote religious uniformity that resulted in a disastrous era of persecution, and the prisons were filled with those who refused to conform to the Roman communion. Parliament passed a rigorous statute for the punishment of heresy, which, though administered with varying degrees of severity in different localities, brought to the stake, in the period of four years, two hundred and eighty persons, among whom were five bishops of the two preceding reigns, the most notable of all being Cranmer and Ridley and Latimer. Many took flight to the Continent, either to the imperial towns of Germany or to Switzerland, where Calvinistic principles were professed.

Persecution was a part of the system for attaining uniformity and so acknowledged as legitimate by almost all sixteenth century religious bodies. In principle Mary did not stand isolated; but her sombre temper caused her to apply the persecuting principle without that shrewd understanding of time, place, or appreciation of the individual status of the accused, which had enabled her father to appear as a social regenerator and defender of his country, although he subjected his many victims to the death penalty with as little ethical compunction as his unhappy daughter. Mary, too, had made herself unpopular by her alliance with the Spanish dynasty;

she allowed her government to be used to promote the interest of the Hapsburg house, and worse than all there were many failures in her continental policy, especially the war with France by which Calais was lost. Even the Pope, Paul IV, who detested the House of Austria and Spain because of its interference in Italy, ceased to be on good terms with the Queen. He spoke of Philip II as a fool and an heretic, took away Pole's legatine authority, and before her death Mary, who had the sturdiness of the Tudors, issued directions that no papal document should be admitted to England.

Immediately after Mary's death (Nov. 17, 1558) the succession of Elizabeth brought about the downfall of this badly conceived and disastrously effected plan for restoring papal absolutism. Elizabeth, though it is doubtful whether her aims were swayed by any deep religious convictions, soon showed her purpose to revert to the reformation status of the Church interrupted by her brother's death. She selected as her counsellors men of known sympathies with the Edwardian Settlement, and the whole machinery of parliament was used to preface this programme of religious restoration. The royal supremacy again took its place on the statute book, but with the significant alteration of the phrase "Supreme Head" into "Supreme Governor". One uniform worship and ritual was prescribed for the whole kingdom in the Uniformity Act, with its accompanying provision of a new revised Common

Prayer Book, which was somewhat more conservative than Edward VI's Second Book. That the passage of this legislation was not by any means generally acceptable may be seen from the fact that when the Prayer Book became law, it passed the House of Lords by a majority only of three votes. A novel feature of this Uniformity Act was a provision which made church attendance on Sundays and Holy Days obligatory under penalty of a money payment. A series of special injunctions were issued for which the usage in Edward's reign was taken as a model. Under the application of these injunctions many church ornaments, vestments, shrines and pictures were destroyed.

It is difficult to see how this crusade on behalf of unadorned worship can be reconciled with the presence in the Elizabethan Prayer Book of the celebrated Ornaments Rubric by which the ritual and ceremonial uses of the earlier period of Edward VI's reign were retained. The Rubric remained a dead letter during the Queen's reign and no attention was given to it, nor did any discussion take place as to its significance. It may have been added to the Book by the Privy Council either as a lure to the conservative party or as a means to explain the exercise of toleration to those who, if they did not fully accept a somewhat radical type of reform, might prove weak in their actual loyalty to Papalism. In any case the government's attempts at reconciliation failed, for though most of the clergy conformed to the new

Settlement the old principles had a strong hold among the people, and of the Marian bishops only one accepted the new regime. The rest were deprived; a few of the sees were now filled with bishops who had been consecrated under Henry and Edward, but the vacancies had mostly to be supplied by new men.

The vacancy in the primatial See of Canterbury, brought about by the death of Cardinal Pole at the close of Mary's reign, was now filled by Matthew Parker under conditions which, without due cause, have given rise to much controversy. The contention that no care was used in providing for a legitimate succession has been abandoned, and now that the historical details of the Consecration as it actually happened are sufficiently established, criticism of the legitimacy of the service has been concentrated by Roman Catholic writers on the technical completeness of the Ordinal used.

In the early years of the reign a revised set of Articles, reduced from forty-two to thirty-eight then increased sometime afterwards to thirty-nine, was prepared under Parker's direction. These formularies, now in a shape which indicate a moderate sympathy with Calvinism, were in 1571 made obligatory on every clergyman admitted to a benefice. The religious programme of the new reign was terminated by the publication of a Catechism and by additions to the Book of Homilies, a collection of authorized sermons which had been issued in Edward's reign.

Carefully drawn as were the statutory enactments for rendering the new church arrangements binding upon the people, they were not found effective. Many alienated themselves from the church services of the new model, and in not a few cases the old ceremonial worship and the Latin use were kept up privately. An addition to the Supremacy Act had to be passed by which these nonconformists of the conservative side were selected for rigorous treatment. Passive resisters were encouraged to pass into obstruction of a more aggressive character by men trained in schools of the Old Learning on the Continent at Louvain, Douai and Rome. Those who hoped for a restoration of communion with the Roman See were wont to look for a change of dynasty through the transference of the crown to Mary, Queen of Scotland, and because of expected aid from the Spanish monarchy, whose representative, Philip II, was incessantly active in opposing everywhere the reforming movement. Rebellion broke out in the north of England, but the promised help from Spain failed to arrive in time. Just as this movement collapsed Pius V issued a bull depriving Elizabeth of her crown and absolving the people from allegiance to her.

This ill-conceived step led to the exercise of a stricter vigilance on all Papists, as those who belonged to the conservative faction were called. Measures of a sterner character were inflicted also upon the emissaries of the Roman propaganda, the so-called "foreign priests" who went about the country encouraging the

disaffected to revolt. Some were imprisoned while others, the more active convicted of wishing to overthrow the existing government in order to secure the final and exclusive predominance of the old faith, were put to death as traitors. The situation became more acute when Philip sent his famous Armada to reduce the kingdom to submission, planning both to make it an appanage of the Spanish Crown and to restore it to the Roman obedience. His purpose was resented even by patriotic Romanists who took part with the rest of their fellow-cuntrymen in resisting foreign aggression. But neither the execution of the Scottish queen nor the defeat of the Armada put a stop to the plots against Elizabeth's life.

The versatile inventiveness of the group of fanatics who wished to secure another ruler only encouraged the government to discover and apply new methods of repression. Through the application of the Act of Thirteenth Elizabeth C. 2, sixty-one priests, forty-nine laymen, it is estimated, were subjected to the death penalty between 1588 and 1603. This is a pitiable record, but it is worth noting that even those who suffered considered this legislation in no way a unique example of the persecuting spirit, while all accepted it as the logical result of the policy of promoting religious uniformity that no religious party except the Anabaptists then questioned. Dr. Ingram does not exaggerate when he says, speaking of the Eilzabethan Settlement (*England and Rome*, p. 223), "It was the mildest form of religious coercion which

had ever been known up to that period since the time when religion became incorporated with the State." Naturally no greater reflection can be cast upon any age than to be obliged to eulogize the doing to death of victims of religious difference in a particular country because those who so perished were few in number. The conditions where such apologies are needed illustrate in what a narrow technical sense the word Reformation must be used.

While on the part of conservatives and Romanists the church order of Elizabeth met with persistent resistence that not infrequently endangered the continuance of her rule, it proved also unsatisfactory to many extreme reformers, especially to refugees from the centres of continental reform where Calvinism predominated. Of this class three hundred returned home after Mary's death determined to press their claims on the government for radical religious changes. The extremists showed their hand in the Convocation of 1563 when a solid "block" was made against the continued use of the surplice, which was only preserved by a narrow majority. The clergy, more particularly in London and the academic bodies of Oxford and Cambridge, were stout champions of Calvinistic reforming standards. The Puritan party, as they now began to be called, engaged in active propagandism; they held clerical meetings of an informal devotional character, intending that ultimately these gatherings might take the place of the recognized church services.

The government intervened by publishing a set of rules called Advertisements, which the bishops were directed to enforce to produce uniformity in doctrine, ceremonies and clerical apparel. One in particular appointed the use of the cope in cathedral and collegiate churches for the ministration of the Holy Communion, while in all ordinary parish churches the surplice was prescribed. As a result a number of the clergy were deprived of their benefices because of their objection to the surplice. But these repressive measures failed to prevent the spread of Puritan disaffection. A formal recommendation was sent to Parliament in 1571 to introduce a complete Presbyterian establishment. Such a proposal was especially distasteful to Elizabeth, who fully appreciated the theocratic tendencies of Calvinism, as they could be observed at close quarters across the Scotch border. The situation was not an easy one to handle, for various members of the episcopate were in notorious sympathy with the Puritan movement. It was not until 1583 when Whitgift, who was opposed only to the administrative side of Calvinism, became Archbishop of Canterbury that the queen had at the head of the English Church a man in entire sympathy with her anti-Puritan policy. Conscious of their strong support among the people and in important cities, the Puritans were not at all deterred by royal disfavor. A document, the Book of Holy Discipline, embodying their demands was presented to Parliament in 1583, and three years later their plans to presbyterianize

the Church were only frustrated by the queen's direct intervention.

Among the Puritan party there was an extreme left wing, who gave up the idea of overturning the national Church, and therefore founded separatist congregations. Prominent in this opposition to the Puritan willingness to bide their time was Robert Browne, who gave his name to the sect that played a considerable rôle later on in English religious history, under the designation of Brownists, or Independents. Not differing with the Presbyterians on doctrinal points, this body held to the principle that any two or three individuals had the right to form a separate autonomous congregation. The tendency to form separatist meetings for religious services soon extended among the Puritan body generally. Repressive measures followed, such as that passed in 1593, which punished by imprisonment attendance at a conventicle or abstention from church services. Obstinate offenders were compelled to forfeit their property and leave the country. The intense feeling caused by these regulations was directed against the bishops, who were virulently attacked in the Marprelate controversy. Three Independent leaders were put to death, and many took refuge in Holland from the sternness of the government which, probably because of the success it had achieved in breaking up Romanist propaganda, had no intention of allowing the Puritan party at the other extreme to impair the standards of the official rule of uniformity.

Discouraging as were the beginnings of the last Anglican Settlement in the sixteenth century, and artificial as appears its existence under government control, it became fortunate not so much in itself as in the enemies it made. The disloyalty of Roman Catholics with their dependence upon Spanish aid on the one hand and Puritan fanaticism on the other, bent, as it was, on establishing an ecclesiastical "*imperium in imperio*", contrived to impress upon the national Church a specifically English character which the legal bulwarks created for it could never have bestowed. There began to emerge before the reign closed a central type of Churchmen whose policy and outlook were based on an appeal to the standards of Christian antiquity and who refused to "swear on the words" of a newer master, either in Rome or Geneva.

Scotland and Ireland

In England's immediate neighboring lands,—Scotland and Ireland,—her own religious transitions exerted much influence, though in the case of Scotland the first impulse to change came from the introduction of Luther's teaching as early as 1527. Persecution followed, and with some victims; yet the new teaching became soon acceptable to the Scotch nobles who looked with no kindly eye on the ancient Church which, in a poor, undeveloped country, was remarkable for its rich endowments. When, after the death of James V, Arran became regent and the demand for innovation grew stronger because of the regent's

favorable attitude, the clash between the two opposing parties led to deeds of violence. The excution of a reforming teacher, Wishart (1546), was soon followed by the murder of Cardinal Beaton, who was held by the champions of the new system to exert a sinister influence in behalf of the conservatives. Under the regency of the queen mother, Mary de Guise, the efforts made by her to maintain the ancient ecclesiastical order were hurt rather than helped by her reliance on aid from her French kinsmen. But the final and most effective attack upon it was due to John Knox, a disciple of Calvin, who may not inappropriately be termed the "fire eater" of the Reformation. No man was his equal in self-confidence, and he went to work to destroy the ancient Church of Scotland in the spirit of the prophets of Israel. Acts of iconoclasm marked the transition from the old to the new order; befere the end of the regency the most stringent laws had been issued against the adherents of the old system. All the savagery of a disordered and ill-controlled community accompanied the establishment of the new order which was modelled after Calvinistic standards. John Knox was notorious for his uncouth speech, and cared little for legality, yet his work had certain admirable qualities because of his fearless withstanding of a self-seeking and ruthless oligarchy. That he could do this indicated not only personal bravery on his part, but also the rise in an almost semi-barbarous society of a middle class which demanded to be heard and heeded.

The advent of Queen Mary on the throne, sympathetic as she was towards the old faith, helped her partisans in no respect. The young queen showed no statesmanship, and what is worse had an awkward capacity for walking into traps set her by her enemies. Her misfortunes and her dignity under them have not unnaturally cast a glamor over a reign which, if judged by itself, was a deplorable failure. Even a more able ruler could hardly have changed the religious history of the country. The ancient Church was an anachronism, opposed as it was to the natural interests of large numbers of Scotchmen and unable to answer the spiritual needs of a new age. Outside of the remote regions in the highlands, adherents of the Roman Communion were not to be found, and the name of Scotland in religious history soon became practically identical with Presbyterianism.

Ireland's record is altogether different; no statutory methods attempted by the Tudor monarchs could induce the Irish to forego their loyalty to the See of Rome. Religious innovations soon became synonymous with alien confiscations which, while they advanced the economic development of the land, only increased the bitterness of the native inhabitants against the efforts of their English masters to force upon them a religious system that they detested. Racial antagonism, adding fire to religious difference, gave to the contest between the old faith and the new a degree of savagery only to be paralleled where there has been in modern times contact in the

same neighborhood of two peoples widely separated in cultural advantages.

France

In France the proximity to reform of the German or Swiss type did not fail, as we have noted in reviewing Calvin's life, to produce imitators there. In spite of repression the movement towards radical change grew, particularly in the south of France. Political programmes, intended to obstruct the advance of Hapsburg power, frequently drew the Valois princes to alliances with the German Protestant princes, a result which generally coincided with the allowance in France of the new teaching. The introduction of Calvin's system, as it gave the French movement a solidifying power, turned it into an active political as well as a religious organization. It found, too, strong supporters among the French nobility, many of whom combined their factional ambitions with those violent passions which so frequently accompany religious difference. The rulers of the Valois line, mostly men of poor capacity and despicable personal character, gave an opportunity to oligarchial intrigue, in which neither the adherents of the old faith nor the new appear in favorable colors.

In 1560 the Protestants, or rather the Reformed, as Calvin's followers must in strictness be called, secured a semi-toleration, but the situation pleased neither side. Civil war broke out more than once; then came, in 1572, the massacre of St. Bartholomew, by

which it was hoped that the danger of the ascendancy of the new religionists might be averted by a murder *en masse*. As first planned the assassination of only a few leading Huguenot champions was proposed; but as this plan failed, wholesale butchery was resolved upon, with a success that anticipates some of the worst misdeeds of the French Revolution. No advantage was gained by the Roman Catholics through this act of savagery; the Protestants not only survived, but secured the retention of the special privileges by which they were allowed to worship, according to their tenets, in certain specified cities and on the estates of the landed nobility. Religious divisions brought the Kingdom into a perilous position, because the Roman Catholics organized a league which depended upon Spain for its chief support, while the Reformers looked to England for aid.

In 1589 the situation became more hopeful because of the accession of Henry IV, a member of the house of Bourbon, who had been trained under Calvinistic influences, but who also, for the sake of religious peace and to preserve his people from Spanish interference, finally adhered to the Roman Communion and conceded toleration by the Edict of Nantes (1598) to his former coreligionists, under which they received general political equality and generous concessions as to public worship. One clause of the Edict by which the Huguenots were to remain in control of several fortresses proved, however, to be the occasion of future disturbances, because it gave the Roman

Catholics the opportunity of making the objection to the Reformed Church that it was an autonomous organization, and therefore anti-national.

Scandinavia

In the Scandinavian kingdoms royal authority played nearly as large a part in effecting a revolution against the old church system as in England. Frederick I of Denmark (1523-33) used Lutheranism as a means to work the downfall of the ancient nobility and the higher ecclesiastical powers, who were closely allied togeher. The new teaching was first tolerated and then made supreme. Roman Catholics were outlawed when Christian III came to the throne in 1536; Norway and Iceland, both dependencies on the Danish Kingdom, soon afterwards followed the precedent set by their rulers. Sweden, though it became independent of Denmark under Gustavus Vasa (1521), adopted a like policy in its church order. Later on Vasa's son, Erich XIV (1560-68), made an attempt to calvinize the Swedish Church but failed. Another son, John III (1568-92), was equally unsuccessful in restoring communion with the Roman See. Further efforts at the close of the century had no more success. Sweden definitely accepted Lutheranism with a unanimity of popular approval that still gives it, so far as religious conformity to one confession is concerned, a unique position in western Europe. Extensive victories of the Lutheran revolt against the Roman supremacy are to be recorded in the duchy of

Prussia, which was during this period a dependency of Poland. From here Lutheranism spread east along the lands of the Baltic Sea. Even in Poland the new teaching, both in its Lutheran and Calvinistic form, took root and for a time toleration was accorded to all confessions. Hungary also proved a fruitful ground for Protestant expansion, and by the beginning of the seventeenth century its position was legally acknowledged. These various accessions of strength give the high-water mark of reform, and we must now turn to trace in more detail the fortunes and internal conditions of the Latin Church from the time of the revolt inaugurated by Luther.

The Counter-Reformation

The loss of such a large section of Europe, with the rapid expansion of Protestantism in countries where loyalty to the Roman See still existed, made plain everywhere the need for reorganization in discipline and in administration. Hadrian VI (1522-23) expressly acknowledged at the Nürnberg Diet the legitimacy of the demand for reform and promised to call a general council to work out the details. It was hoped that this programme would keep many from joining Luther, and would encourage active measures against his propaganda. None of these expectations were fulfilled. The pontificate of Hadrian was soon brought to an end by his death, and his successor, Clement VII (1523-34), a typical Florentine prelate with a highly developed taste for political

intrigue, acquired in the school of the Medici, contrived to make Charles V his enemy. Rome was besieged and taken by an imperial army, in which German Protestants and German Roman Catholics acted as allies against the pope's supporters.

All thought of reform was abandoned in the centre of Latin Christendom; the mainstay of the reforming programme was now Charles V, who put such pressure on the Roman authorities that the next pope, Paul III (1534-49), agreed to call a general council to meet at Mantua in 1537. Objections were made in Germany to holding a council on Italian soil, and the plan of settling religious differences by conciliar action appeared to many almost hopeless. Political methods of defence or expansion were far more popular, since they promised more immediate results. After much delay the papal plan was realized when a Council met at Trent in 1545, a place selected because, though it was on the Italian side of the Alps, it stood in imperial territory and was in close proximity to Germany.

The location at Trent was far from being acceptable to the Curia, which made obstinate efforts to have the session removed to an Italian town nearer Rome. It was finally agreed, after an outbreak of malignant fever at Trent, that the removal should be made to Bologna; this was resisted because the city was an appanage of the pope. The Spanish members of the Council protested and the emperor prevented the transfer, but it was not until 1551, after Julius III

(1550-55) had become pope, that its sessions were resumed at Trent. A further interruption occurred the next year when Moritz of Saxony at the head of an anti-imperial army penetrated as far south as the Tyrol. The next pope, Paul IV (1555-59), who was strongly anti-Hapsburg and pro-Italian, had no intention of reviving the Tridentine assembly. Its final resuscitation took place as late as 1562, under the ponntificate of Pius IV (1559-65), and the sessions ended two years before the pope's death.

Troubled by outside opposition, the experience of the Council itself was anything but calm and regular. The members debated a long time as to what questions they should take up and where they should begin. Curial interests were directly involved in the proposals as to reform, and therefore every effort was made to keep such questions from being debated at all by the Council, because the central governing machinery of the Church might be affected. Without harmony on this subject no far-reaching plans could be developed of the kind actually needed to remedy abuses. Cardinal Marone, the president of the Council, in his final speech confessed that dissatisfaction on this head was legitimate. Yet in spite of the failure to accomplish results on a large scale, some useful measures were passed. The formal selling of indulgences, ecclesiastical "provisions" and "expectancies" were abolished; also the mediæval custom of pledging children to the monastic life, the age of profession now being raised to the age of sixteen for boys

and twelve for girls. Clandestine marriages were prohibited, and church marriages could only be contracted with the presence of the priest and before two or three witnesses. A number of superstitious practices connected with public worship were dropped, a new edition of the Roman Mass ordered, and a Congregation of Rites appointed to regulate all questions of public worship.

Another important change of widespread influence was due to the decree by which every diocese was directed to provide a special seminary for the education of the priesthood. In many cases the Tridentine canons renewed certain disciplinary measures, which in the course of time had been laxly administered. It began to be seen that the old situation could not be continued without peril; accordingly a new spirit of rigorism was introduced; for example, the passing of an examination before the properly constituted authorities was made a condition of the induction of a priest into a parochial cure. Attempts were made to secure permission for clerical marriage by the Emperor Ferdinand and the Duke of Bavaria, but without success. In regard to communion in both kinds, a compromise measure was promulgated in a papal brief after the close of the Council by which, for a fixed number of years, the administration of the chalice was allowed in certain cases.

Doctrinally the work of the Council gave to the Roman Church the same hard, precise line of dogmatic statement already found in the various con-

tinental Confessions, the effort being to differentiate in every respect the old faith from the new. Practically the Council was a success from the point of view of those who desired the Roman Church to consolidate its strength in the face of the enemy. No quarter to those not children of the Church was from now on the watchword of strict Roman Catholics. The Church was placed under martial law and this great historic communion entered a new phase, aptly discribed by Wilfrid Ward as a "State of Siege."

Valiant work was done in securing this result by the Society of Jesus, a community founded in 1534 by a Spaniard, Ignatius Loyola, who drew round him six companions, all earnest in the purpose of converting the Moslem population of the Holy Land; and if this were not to be found practicable, the whole body agreed to accept the direction of the pope and undertake any work he saw fit to appoint. A plan embracing pastoral work, preaching, religious instruction for the young, foreign missionary work, secured papal approval in 1540. The new Society of Jesus, as it was called, grew rapidly; by the time of its founder's death in 1556 it numbered 1,000 members, spread throughout Europe, and was engaging with great zeal and a remarkably perfected organization in parochial and more especially educational activities. The Jesuits proved most successful in acting as a bulwark in preventing further defections to Protestantism and even in winning converts in considerable numbers from all the communions which had taken

part in the revolt against the Roman See. The administration of higher education in Roman Catholic countries fell almost exclusively into Jesuit hands. Ignatius himself founded, in 1551 in Rome, the *Collegium Romanum*, where the official teaching of the Roman Church in theology and philosophy was concentrated and expounded under the Society's auspices.

Although not so important or spectacular in their achievements as the Jesuits, other new religious communities arose during the sixteenth century, which proved the presence in the Latin Chruch of a serious desire to meet new spiritual aspirations, individual and social. Specially to be noted are the Theatines, founded shortly after the Lutheran revolt by Cardinal Cajetan of Thiene and Bishop Caraffa of Theate and the Capucines, intended to restore the original Franciscan intention; these last became a separate order in 1619. Interesting, too, was the foundation by Philip Neri, at Rome in 1564, of the Oratorians, who were governed by simple rule of life under which the free play of individuality was provided for and encouraged. Various new organizations, such as the Fathers of Christian Teaching, and the Pietists, devoted themselves to educational work, while the care of the sick, the poor and orphans was undertaken by the Ursulines, the Brothers of Mercy, and the Somaskists.

The Anabaptists

The complications and cross-currents,— political, theological and moral,—of the age of religious revolution are by no means exhausted when one has catalogued the various official organisms under which nationalities or groups within the nation reached a doctrinal formulation and became an ecclesiastical establishment sanctioned by the State. The picture of this period of transition is not complete without a sketch of the Anabaptists, who may be regarded as the *enfants terribles* of the Reformation. From the general principles accepted by the great national or international champions of reform, the authority and organizing power in the Church come from the Holy Scriptures alone. The escape from pure subjectivism or individualism was made by insisting that the interpretation of the Bible should be by authoritative exegesis under the supervision of regularly trained teachers or officials, who themselves had to be guided by elaborate formularies drawn up with technical exactness. This arrangement did not appeal to many who found in the Bible a good deal which they could not discover in the official teaching of any existing religious organization; others, too, believed in the freedom of an enlightened believer to cultivate spheres of religious consciousness not directly provided for in the Scriptures. State recognition of religion was also felt to be an unworthy compromise with the powers of evil, or in any case a sharp differentiation

was made between the law of nature and the state of grace.

The desire for free religious expression, the feeling that the new pastors were as closely allied with the middle and upper classes as the old priesthood, and an ill-defined but strongly felt demand for better social conditions gave rise to the Anabaptist movement. Its chief traits were early manifested in the enthusiastic belief in the inner light of subjective illumination, separation from the State, the profession of brotherly love, a passive attitude in the face of persecution and hatred of the secular power. Their symbol of divergence was the practice of late baptism, or more exactly, since they rejected the custom of infant baptism, the re-baptizing of those who had received infant baptism. Luther took from the first an uncompromising attitude; Zwingli tried compromise and then, after experiencing the Anabaptist stubborn temper, was willing to appeal to force. Soon, when the propaganda proved its attractiveness for the masses in many west European countries, the Anabaptists, in spite of their protest as to their inoffensiveness, were treated as outlaws and unmercifully persecuted by Roman Catholics, Lutherans and Zwinglians.

Under the stress of misfortune, numbers of Anaabaptists turned to the consoling hope of a shortly-to-be-realized coming of God's earthly kingdom, and, abandoning the doctrine of non-resistance, adopted the theory that there was imposed upon them the

duty of using the sword to root out the ungodly. These ideas were incorporated by Hoffmann and Bockelson in the short-lived theocracy set up at Münster, where the fantastic side of Anabaptism culminated in deeds of lawless violence and excess that were avenged with a ruthless temper when Münster was besieged in 1535 and taken by the confederated princes of the neighborhood, who laid aside their religious differences to act against a common foe.

After this catastrophe the quietistic group of Anabaptists got the upper hand under the direction of Menno Simons (d. 1559). It became a mystical, inoffensive system of lay religion, stressing separation from the world in dress and social customs, and in this form it founded communities in Germany, Holland, England, America and France. Some of these, taking on a more liberal cast, came in contact with English Independents and with groups of anti-Trinitarians in other countries.

Interesting speculative thought, which in many ways anticipates the tendencies of the modern religious consciousness, is associated with the names of Anabaptist teachers such as Denk, Hætzer, Schoenfeld, and, most of all, Jacob Böhme, who built up a strikingly original metaphysical system of dualism, taking as his initial principle the acceptance of the inner light. More conspicuous even were the services rendered by Anabaptism to the recognition of the right of toleration. It is easy

to see how with their exclusive emphasis on subjectivism, they insisted that the State should keep from interfering with personal feelings and conscience and was bound to allow groups of individuals as they saw fit, without control from without, to organize religious communities.

VII.

DIVIDED CHRISTENDOM IN MODERN TIMES

FROM the era of religious revolution onwards, the history of Western Christendom falls into four great groups, a result of the fact that the main religious divisions of the sixteenth century tended, as time went on, to grow into four closed systems, mutually exclusive,— Anglicanism, Calvinism, Lutheranism and Romanism. The first three were *en rapport* solely on the basis of a common antagonism to the newly invigorated Roman Communion,—itself, through its strict Tridentine orthodoxy and discipline as well as by the transformations introduced by the Society of Jesus, practically as much a product of the age of Reform as the three communions of revolt, which have often appeared to justify their existence simply because of their opposition to a Latinized Christianity dominated by curial absolutism. Probably without the divergencies arising from national policy and temperamental differences the four great groups of separated Western Christians, so far as their doctrinal declarations are concerned, would not find themselves far enough removed from one another to make mutual attack and recrimination their most conspicuous platform.

The Anglican Church

The Anglican Church came to adopt a more definite and clear-cut distinction from the direct offsprings of anti-papal revolt. As time went on the happenings of the English Reformation were appreciated in a juster perspective; insular self-consciousness tended by itself to stress the conservative factors in English religious life as against the radical changes found elsewhere. The episcopate, remaining intact, was valued first practically and, later, on the grounds of historic continuity, as was shown by the expressed declaration on the part of various Anglican leaders, of a belief in the doctrine of Apostolic Succession. Nor does the episcopate stand alone as an evidence of the desire to preserve carefully the old through times of crisis and change. In the whole organization of the Church one can note the care taken to maintain the indelible character of the priestly office, while such acts as the retention of the bishops in the House of Lords, the preservation of ecclesiastical courts, the inviolability conceded to the propertied possessions of the Church, are so many cumulative proofs of the unwillingness of Englishmen to break with the mediæval Church except on points where there was judged to be a real conflict with the claims of national autonomy and primitive tradition.

The opposition already described as coming from both Roman Catholics and Puritans against the National Church continued after the accession of the

Stuarts. An attempt was made under James I to secure a *modus vivendi* by a conference, but the forces of separatism were too strong, especially as the cleavage became associated with strongly drawn lines on constitutional questions. The Anglican leaders allied themselves with the advocates of monarchical absolutism, while the supporters of Geneva doctrine and discipline were closely associated with the party which maintained the sovereignty of Parliament. The contrast between the two systems became clearly marked in James I's reign in theory and practice. Bishop Andrewes presented the developed type of Anglican churchmanship, which had moved far away in theology and in ceremonial customs from the Puritan model.

In the generation immediately following Andrewes, Archbishop Laud applied with a vigorous spirit in his administration the claim that the English Church stood for a revival under a national form of the accepted standards of Catholic antiquity. A friend of learning himself, and in his doctrinal position a champion of toleration, he contrived by his support of the royal prerogative in his contest with Puritanism to ride roughshod over those who failed to follow him and subjected his opponents to merciless and unsympathetic treatment. The irritating discipline exercized by Laud helped to make the Church odious in the eyes of many able and sane-minded patriots, who detested the weak and vacillating government of the Stuarts. The alliance of the Laudian Church, with

an inefficient and unsuccessful executive power, brought a common ruin to both. Accordingly, when the Long Parliment met in 1640 its successful measures in dealing with the exercise of royal prerogative were coupled with an unrelenting attack on the Laudian system. The Archbishop himself perished a not-unwilling martyr to his convictions; and however one may condemn the errors of judgment and temper which may easily be brought against Laud, there can be no doubt that Ranke's estimate of him as a great ecclesiastical statesman will stand; nor is further investigation likely to alter the force of the measured words of Gladstone describing his achievements, when he spoke of him as the man who prevented the English Church from being bound in the fetters of an iron system of compulsory Calvinistic belief.

Yet the significance of his work was not immediately visible, because the victory of the parliamentary party gave the Calvinistic church system a position which seemed unassailable. The Anglican Church that appeared to be merely the weaker partner of the Stuart monarchy gave place to an ecclesiastical establishment modelled after Presbyterian standards. It was soon seen, however, that the theocratic tendencies of Calvinism would be resented in England. The exercise of discipline remained in the hands of Parliament and was not entrusted to the usual organs of church administration. This violation of the strict principles of Scotch Presbyterianism made it easy for Cromwell to introduce the practice of a fairly wide

system of toleration, under which Independency or Congregationalism virtually became the recognized method of church government. All Christians, as a matter of fact, except Romanists, Anglican and Antinomians, were protected in the exercise of their religion. Strict measures were meted out to the Anglican clergy, who as royalists were regarded as enemies of the State. Using the Prayer Book was a penal offence; and many, under this rigorous rule, were obliged to seek refuge abroad.

A new era was ushered in by the Stuart restoration; the episcopate resumed without difficulty the control of the dioceses; church property was returned and many of the parish clergy were brought back to the benefices from which they had been ejected under Cromwell's rule. The question of the treatment of other ecclesiastical organizations became a vexed problem. The Restoration had been ushered in with a promise of liberty of conscience for all who would peaceably submit to the change of government. Unfortunately this programme was not carried out; the oppression of the old regime had left many rankling sores behind. The Puritan party was divided into two great groups,— the Presbyterians and Independents,— not to mention smaller organizations. There was a popular demand for a revival of the traditional monarchical policy of religious uniformity, and the question was how to secure it. A conference was held at the Savoy in London (1661) to settle this matter, and it ended in showing that there was no prac-

ticable common ground between Anglican and Puritan, and so no basis of uniformity. In doctrine and in ceremonial practice the two were far apart, and when the decision had to be made as to which system was to be the sole recognized legal establishment, the Anglican Church, with its Prayer Book revised in many details in an anti-Puritan direction, attained an exclusively priviledged parliamentary position by a new Act of Uniformity (1662). Two thousand Presbyterian and Independent ministers, finding themselves unable to conform, organized bodies of Protestant Non-conformists, the first official creations of this type of Dissenters.

The rest of the Stuart period is marked by an almost continuous contest for the recognition of religious toleration. Severe legislation was passed against all bodies outside the National Church, by which not only was the practice of their religion interfered with, but even the civil status of their members affected. While these rigid rules were due to parliamentary statute, the cause of toleration was not helped by its advocacy on the part of the royal executive or by the methods used by Charles II and his brother James II, both under Roman Catholic influence, to override through the exercise of the royal prerogative the law of the land. A crisis was reached when James II tried with diplomatic and devious means to repeat the experiment made by Queen Mary, a century before, of bringing the National Church into communion with the Roman See. His

policy led directly to the revolution of 1688 under which the Stuart family were expatriated and a purely constitutional system was introduced.

With this change a Toleration Act was enacted, which gave freedom of worship to all Protestant Trinitarian Non-conformists. Certain prerogative rights were maintained in favor of the doctrine and practice of the Anglican Church, though the parliamentary support it secured at this time was of most questionable utility. The Caroline period is famous as a time of religious revival; and the Church and its services became firmly fixed in the hearts of the people. Among the clergy were many men of exalted character and unusual learning. Fixed as was the demarcation between the Anglicans and Non-conformists, the National Church itself was far from being harmoniously circumstanced. In its own members one can notice the cleavages of parties, the High Churchmen on one side and the Latitudinarians on the other, and in both groups doctrinal differences were accentuated by political affiliations with the historic divisions between the Tory and Whigs. Some High Churchmen still held so tenaciously to the principle of royal prerogative and right that they refused to take the oath of allegiance to William III. These so-called Non-Jurors organized a schism which continued to exist until the beginning of the nineteenth century.

The identification of political partisanship with the support of the National Church as it showed itself in

the reigns of William III and his sister-in-law, Queen Anne, especially in the antagonism between the lower house of Convocation, which was Tory, and the upper house composed of bishops, who were almost altogether Whig, was but the introduction to a period of reaction and apathy by which the Georgian epoch was distinguished. It was the uniform policy of the first two Hanoverians to encourage the Latitudinarian party by official promotion and patronage. Convocation was suppressed because of its known sympathies with the party which regretted the downfall of the Stuarts. Under the repressive ecclesiastical system by which Whig ascendancy was secured, the Church became hardly more than a branch of governmental administration. This result is conspicuous in the conduct of the Georgian bishops, who as a rule paid little attention to their dioceses, and satisfied themselves by living lives of leisure under the conditions of affluence common to the country gentry of their time. The age was one of conventionality and respectability, and everywhere throughout all religious communions acquiescence in existing standards was the accepted rule. In religion reason in its common-sense form was taken as the supreme court of appeal; nothing was so much dreaded or suspected as the introduction of appeals to the emotional side of man's nature.

Little was done to satisfy the religious needs of a new type of population brought into existence by the great industrial advance made by England during the Georgian Age. In a time ripe for change and relig-

ious reform it was the misfortune of the Anglican Church that, through the rigidity of its administration and the short-sightedness of its official class, that the great career of John Wesley produced its remarkable results outside the communion of which he was a member. The principles he adopted were in the sharpest contrast to all that the Georgian Church held to as its chief support. Wesley went out among the neglected masses whom the parish system could not touch, and by the sincerity of his language and the directness of his appeal brought home to them with unequalled force the message of God's love. But oratorical power and energy in conversion of souls did not exhaust the capacity of this great leader. His talents as an organizer were remarkable; in a short time he extended systematically in carefully constructed detail the new society of which he was the head and director. As time went on the separation between the new organization and the Church became more defined. Though Wesley himself, with obvious sincerity, protested that his followers were to work inside and not without the Church of England, he took no care in guiding his society to see that the standard of loyalty felt by himself should be imposed upon others. As early as 1744 the first Wesleyan Conference plainly affirmed that "while they did not desire a schism in the Church, they must not neglect the present opportunity of saving souls for fear of consequences." By 1760 the Holy Communion was administered by lay preachers, and

in 1784 Wesley, apparently without realizing the consequences of his acts, set apart in a formal religious service, as bishops, two members of his society to oversee the Wesleyan propaganda in America.

The influence of the Wesleyan movement on Anglicans could hardly remain for long merely in the form of opposition. Wesley's strong personality worked on men who differed from him both in his views on theology and as to his policy towards the National Church. From this group, who held a modified Calvinistic system and stressed the subjective element in religion, came the modern Low Church, or more accurately speaking the Evangelical party, which dominated for a great part of a century the Church of England. Such men as Fletcher, Venn, Romaine and Newton, though without creative intellectual power, brought the influence of personal religion to bear in crowded centres of population and in remote country districts. The lethargy of the Georgian Age was overcome, and subjective as was the teaching of Evangelicalism, it produced a quickening of the national conscience that showed itself in splendid measures of reform, such as the abolition of the slave trade and the improvement of conditions of prisons.

When raised, however, to official leadership, defects of organizing capacity on the part of the Evangelicals made it impossible for them to appreciate the corporate life of the Church, and it was this task which came to be the heritage of the champions of the new religious revival of the nineteenth century which is known

as the Oxford Movement. This movement took its inception from the crisis brought about by the Reform Act of 1832, when statesmen who aimed to do away with the political abuses for which an oligarchy, long continued in power, had made themselves responsible, were about to treat the Church as a branch of governmental administration which required most drastic remedies to bring it up to the new ideals of efficiency. Under the guidance of the celebrated Rugby educator, Dr. Arnold, who thoroughly believed in the validity of the religious conciousness but had little sympathy with its historic forms, a scheme was worked out by which the past was to be broken with and for the inherited system of the Church was to be substituted a comprehensive arrangement, according to which the government was to bring together under one fold all men who were willing to accept certain vaguely defined expressions of Christian doctrine. This proposed interference of the State, as well as the intangibility of Dr. Arnold's doctrinal position, brought about the genesis of an opposition led almost entirely by men trained at the University of Oxford.

As the bishops and officials of the Church showed little consciousness of the need of leadership in this epoch of change, a series of Tracts were prepared, intended to place before the educated classes the sacramental side of the doctrine and life of the Church. Historical continuity and an anti-individualistic theology were the main characteristics of these Tracts. Attention both favorable and antagonistic

greeted the new movement. Its strength lay in its leaders, men of weight and power at Oxford,— Keble, Newman and Pusey. Its weakness was the conviction that so great a cause could be fought out and finally decided by academic methods. The lessons taught by the Wesley revival, that the popular imagination must be appealed to and popular needs understood and answered, were not appreciated. Newman, with all his power of dialectic, and in spite of the depth and sincerity of his religious convictions, became involved in superficial controversial questions concerning the relation of the English Church with the Roman Communion. This was a tactical error, because not only was the Roman Church numerically weak in England, but it was suspected, on the basis of its history in the Tudor and Stuart periods, of a desire to attain power and position by methods of indirection and intrigue. Suspicions of this type were exaggerated, of course, but their presence in the mind of many people was sufficient to bring the Tractarian teaching into obloquy as disloyal and novel.

The storm broke when Newman published Tract XC, which was wrongly understood to advocate a Roman Catholic interpretation of the Anglican Articles. As Newman's method was appropriate only to a treatise on the history of dogma, it is not surprising that the exact significance of the tract was altogether lost in the heat of polemical discussion. Some of Newman's disciples who did not share his disciplined intellectual powers became outspoken in their admi-

ration for all that was Roman, and spoke contemptuously of the Church to which they belonged. In the atmosphere of excitement the unwise and unrestrained speech of the younger Tractarians stirred the university authorities, who were men fitted only and chosen chiefly to direct routine academic life in the quiet, humdrum life of an ancient university, to unwise and tyrannical action. Newman, who had been for some time dissatisfied with his theory of the Via Media, which made the Anglican Church fill the place of the "just mean" between Romanism and Anglicanism, despaired of finding in it a place for the consistency of faith and the continuity of catholic life which he sought. He and many others — laymen as well as the clergy — seceded to Rome, a defection which deprived the Tractarians of many of their ablest members.

But the catastrophe was not irreparable, because some who had stood closest to Newman from the beginning of the movement now refused to follow him. Keble and Pusey adhered to a strict maintenance of the principles set forth in the Tracts, and the Oxford Movement after its defeat in the university gained strength elsewhere. Higher standards of efficiency in the diocese and in the parish were introduced. There were more frequent services, and due emphasis was given to the central position of sacramental teaching; an era began of church expansion at home and abroad, with its outward manifestation in the building of new curches, the organization of

societies, and the extension of the episcopate to the colonies. It must not be forgotten that this renewed vitality, closely as it is connected with the neo-Catholic revival at Oxford, was non-partisan on the whole and non-exclusive. The impetus to energetic development in thought and in action can be seen in men and groups far removed from direct sympathy with the Tractarians. Both Evangelicals and those who looked up to Arnold or to Maurice, a religious thinker of unique power, who treated from a philosophical standpoint the problems of the faith, were contributors to the full impetus of religious revival and reform.

While the reserve forces of the Church were being solidly accummulated, ecclesiastical life on the surface was disturbed for many years after the secession of Newman by questions involving the right of the state courts to interfere with matters of doctrine and ceremonial. This dilemma was created by the peculiar relation between the civil and ecclesiastical powers, under which the sovereignty of Parliament had come to be supreme over all organs of national life. In the nineteenth century, after the principle of religious uniformity had long been forgotten and the exercise of toleration had led to an unparalleled development of sects and creeds, it was strange to find that Tudor precedents of church control could still be enforced by civil courts. Lay judges were seen oracularly deciding theological points with the same finality as a Curial Congregation, and as these decisions

were criticised or protested against, a more determined effort was made by parlimentary enactment (the Public Worship Bill) to prevent the growth of ceremonial usages in the Church, which were regarded as an insidious attempt to do away with the principles of the Reformation.

The younger adherents of the Tractarian Party, who gave a practical and popularly understood interpretation of the platform of the early leaders, emphasized the need of æsthetic appeal in public worship and showed how it was to be attained by the revival of historic ceremonial usages, were called Ritualists. It was this group who were specifically aimed at in the repressive statutes passed by Parliament on questions of interpreting prayer book rubrics, and several clergy who doubted the compentency of lay courts to impose their decisions on matters of faith and worship were willing to go to prison rather than acknowledge the exercise of secular jurisdiction. It began soon to be realized that these attempts to secure uniformity were an anachronism; finally the bishops themselves recognized the wisdom of discouraging ritual prosecutions. The great test case came when Bishop King of Lincoln was brought before the the Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Benson, on the charge of ritual lawlessness (1891). It was found on appeal to the Privy Council that the insistence on rigidity had no longer the support of the court of highest instance. Practically all of the main contentions of the Tractarian School are now regarded as

legitimate, although those who disagree with them might still regard their teaching as ill-advised or unnecessary.

There has been a general decay of partisanship and a growing willingness of groups or factions of Churchmen to allow that various and differing types of practice and doctrine may find in the Church an unobstructed expression. Party lines are much less strictly drawn to-day and popular interest is concentrated on greater spheres of religious energy where all can join together to promote a common end. A good picture of the English Church to-day may be seen in its revived representative bodies, the two Convocations of Canterbury and York, in the diocesan conferences, and in the multifarious societies for educational, social or philanthropic purposes. By far the two most contested subjects of debate in England's religious life in recent years have been the question of a separate school system under church control and the programme of disestablishment under which the Church will lose its privileged position due to the State connection and also most of its endowments.

The Roman Catholic Church

In following the progress of the Roman Catholic communion from the beginning of the seventeenth century, one finds the lead in activity and interest taken by the Church of France. After the successful obstruction to further advance of either Lutheranism or Calvinism in Germany through the work of the

Counter-reformation, a period of confessional bitterness followed which led to the disastrous Thirty Years' War, in which not only both sides suffered but the whole character of German life bore for a long time the imprint of the destruction wrought by the struggle. In contrast France, after it had passed the age of sectarian strife, displayed in the field of religion wonderful recuperative powers. Among the French clergy there were high standards of intellectual attainment allied with the cultivation of the spirit of devotion and sacrifice for worthy ends. One has only to notice the services rendered to erudition by the Benedictine Congregation of St. Maur and recall the spiritual fervor of the members of the Society of Port Royal, not to mention the great individual figures of Bossuet and Fenelon, to measure the achievements of the Church of France.

For many years, owing to the growth of the French monarchy, the question of how far the Gallican Church was autonomous was vigorously debated. The proximate occasion of a contest with the Roman See was the condemnation by the pope of a revival of Augustinianism due to Cornelius Jansen, a Dutch bishop, whose speculations gained him many supporters in France. Later on the right of the monarchy in administering the Church was affirmed in the four Gallican Articles, by which were maintained a strictly constitutional theory of papal government, and a limitation on the pope's right to come to a final decision on matters of faith apart from the general consent of

the Church. From France these principles passed into German lands, where in the eighteenth century they were formulated at length with historical addenda by Bishop von Hontheim, suffragan of Trier, under the name of Febronius. Interest and active sympathy was felt in many quarters of Germany for these propositions, which tended to apply the tenets of constitutionalism to the Curia. In Austria, under the direction of monarchical paternalism, much was done by Joseph II to deprive the Church of its privileged autonomous position and bring it under the supervision of a beaureaucratic government. Most significant of the influence of the eighteenth century secular absolutism on the Church was the dissolution of the Jesuit Society that followed the various royal decrees against the order in Portugal, Spain and Naples.

The local history of the papacy itself since the Reformation attests its decline from its earlier influence and importance. The Roman See no longer took the leadership in international politics; it was content with the humbler rôle of following rather than directing the great national states which held to its communion. Even the concession of a veto in papal conclaves was allowed to the executives of France, Spain and Austria. After the reforms of Trent no change was made in curial organization except that measures were taken, with some good results, to do away with papal nepotism. Temporal rule over portions of central and northeastern Italy was continued, which in-

volved the governing of some cities of considerable size by ecclesiastics. Such a system was not felt as an especial anomaly, and in the quiet *laissez faire* attitude of the eighteenth century it looked as if nothing could happen to disturb the satisfying, tranquil repose in a Church which had been rudely shaken two centuries before.

The era of revolution disturbed this peaceful atmosphere, first of all in the centre of upheaval. The French Church found itself transformed by the changes of 1789. Freedom of conscience and toleration in public worship were features of the new constitution. To meet the demands of an exhausted treasury all the property of the Church was confiscated and appropriated for national uses. Religious orders were dissolved, the number of bishoprics reduced from one hundred and thirty-four to eighty-three, and along with this distructive work the Constituent Assembly adopted a constructive ecclesiastical policy by which the ancient system of episcopal election by citizen voters was introduced. The ties with the papacy became hardly more than nominal and institution into the vacant sees was in the hands of the metropolitans. This was the new Civil Constitution of the clergy which caused a widespread revolt. About 40,000 priests preferred to withdraw into exile rather than accept its provisions. Four diocesan bishops and three suffragans were alone left to continue on the hierarchy. As the climax of the revolution was reached and after the downfall of monarchy, the

extreme revolutionists (1793) took drastic action in favor of a national religion of Reason, which meant that the exercise of Christian worship was forbidden for several years.

The change to a period of political moderation brought relief. By 1798 Christian services were again restored in forty thousand parishes throughout the country. Later, when Napoleon Bonaparte became First Consul, communion with the Roman See was regularized anew by the Concordat of 1801, under which instrument the Church of France continued to exist for over a century. No attempt was made to return the property taken from the Church in 1789, but the State, as a compensation, agreed to be responsible for all ecclesiastics. The bishoprics were reduced to sixty, freedom of conscience and public worship remained, and in order not to return to the repressive ideals of the old regime a statement was made that the Roman Church was the religion of a large majority of the French people. As an appendix to the Concordat, certain Organic Laws were passed which considerably restricted the autonomy of the Church and most noticably placed under government regulation and oversight the relations of the Roman See with it. All teachers in seminaries were required to bind themselves to accept the four Gallican Articles drawn up in the reign of Louis XIV. Decrees of the pope and of foreign synods were not recognized in France without governmental sanction, while in the country itself no church assemblies could be held

unless the government permitted. When the Bourbons were restored the Napoleonic law continued in force, the only modifications being the establishment of a few bishoprics and the accordance of a legal status to certain religious orders.

In the middle of the nineteenth century steps were taken to organize a voluntary system of public education under religious auspices, first extending to secondary schools alone, then in the Third Republic, amplified by the foundation of a few church universities with courses in professional instruction, but without the right to confer degrees. The general identification of the Church with parties inimical to Republicanism was to some extent responsible for the wave of anti-clericalism which has marked French life for more than a generation. In the educational field the battle raged bitterly, with the result that lay influence won the victory. The attention of the State was then directed to the religious orders, which had gained a strong economic position as well as a prepondering influence in religious propaganda. Various restrictions were imposed which, as they were not accepted, lead to a dissolution of various communities and the ex-appropriation of their endowments. Finally, when President Loubet's visit to Rome was protested against by the Curia, diplomatic relations were broken off with Rome and a Separation Act was passed that reduced the French Church to a voluntary organization, under restrictions of State supervision and control which have been criticised with some

justice as vexatious and in violation of modern standards of religious freedom.

In other continental countries the influence of the French conquests during the Revolution and Napoleonic period made itself felt in the existing ecclesiastical order. Many German sees, whose bishops up to this time had maintained territorial sovereignty, lost their domains. In Regensburg, in 1803, a resolution was passed which provided for secularization on a large scale of religious foundations and abbeys. Later on various new arrangements of dioceses and provinces were introduced, and in many cases the changes resulted in placing large Roman Catholic populations under the sovereignty of Protestant rulers. Strife arose in several districts over the question of mixed marriage where the application of the state law led to unavailing protests from the church authorities. In Prussia in the "thirties" both Prussian Roman Catholic archbishops,— the one of Cologne and the other of Posen,—were deposed by the government and subjected to imprisonment. Under the pressure of various beaureaucratic restrictions, Prussian Roman Catholics were again in the "seventies" impelled to inaugurate a vigorous protest against state interference with the Church that introduced the famous *Kulturkampf*. This led to the organization of a Church political party, called the Centre, of such strength that Chancellor Bismarck was forced to make concessions by which legal autonomy was secured for the Roman Catholic hierarchy in Church administration.

With the growth of the principle of toleration the Roman Catholic minority in the Netherlands and in Great Britain attained increase in numbers and influence, while on the external side new sees were created to provide for the regular supervision of their adherents. In Spain the constant revolutions brought many changes affecting monastic orders, diocesan and parochial property; for example, in 1859, by an arrangement with Rome, all church property not used for the actual support of the clergy was absorbed by the State. Since the Bourbon restoration in 1875, Spanish conservatives have generally tended to encourage the clerical party because of its monarchical sympathies. Only recently, under a liberal government, have steps been taken to deal with the growth of monastic orders, an action which finally brought about a rupture with the Vatican.

In Italy after the revolution in 1848 the kingdom of Sardinia took the lead in doing away with the remaining mediæval elements of the Church system; monastic communities, the collection of tithes, the right of asylum, and legal exemptions were all abolished. On account of the downfall of foreign domination in the Penisula, these features of Piedmontese legislation were extended elsewhere with important supplemental legislation by which church property was absorbed by the State and the clergy made dependent on salaries received from this source. Finally the territories controlled by the pope were annexed after troubled times in which the mainte-

nance of the temporal power was only secured by the intervention of Austria and France. Step by step the Italian kingdom was extended toward Rome; then when the French garrison was withdrawn on the outbreak of war between France and Germany, the papal capitol, after a weak show of resistance, was taken by the army of Victor Emmanuel (September, 1870). Certain privileges of extra-territoriality and monetary compensation were offered and declined by the Curia, which since this time has maintained an irreconcilable attitude toward the Italian government on all questions relating to the occupation of Rome.

In its effort to exercise sovereignty over people and princes, the papacy has gradually receded from its mediæval claims. The deposition of Elizabeth by Pius V is the last conspicuous act of this character. It is somewhat significant, too, that it allowed a reaffirmation of the Gallican principles made by the French bishops regarding the sovereignty of the monarch in temporal concerns. The same attitude was observed when the Irish bishops in 1825 expressly disavowed the right of the pope to exercise authority in matters of state concern. With the practical subsidence of this claim there arose a discussion as to the relation of the papacy to the whole body of the Church. The episcopal theory affirmed in the Gallican articles by which the pope's supremacy was in reality reduced to a primacy of dignity and honor was opposed by the tenet of papal absolutism in doctrine and administration. During the revolu-

tionary era the policy of secularization weakened the episcopate, and the rise of democracy encouraged the tendencies already strongly at work to transform the whole machinery of the Church according to the ideals of absolute centralized control as the best protection against liberalism.

In the official theological schools the thesis of papal infallibility rapidly gained ground; it was popular in the religious orders and especially among the Jesuits. In Rome itself it was practically acted upon by Pius IX in the declaration by which the Immaculate Conception (1852) was made an article of faith "by his supreme and infallible oracle." The controversy was brought to a close by the Vatican Council, although there was a strong opposition which thought the proposal to declare the pope infallible either inopportune or contrary to earlier teachings. Finally the council, on the 18th of July, 1870, accepted a formula which to a certain degree resembled a compromise when it promulgated as a dogma the proposition that the pope is infallible when he speaks "ex cathedra", i.e. whenever he is performing the function of the official mouthpiece of the Church. The promulgation of this dogma caused a revolt among a small number of Roman Catholics in Germany and Switzerland who organized a separate body, known since as the Old Catholic Church.

Another troubled period was ushered in during the early years of the present century through the teaching of Modernism, a movement which aimed at the

free appropriation by Roman Catholics, without official interference, of the critical, historical and philosophical standards of modern thought. A formidable campaign was instituted against the innovations by papal pronunciamentos, and also by the construction of special machinery for discovering, suspending and removing clergy who were suspected of sympathy with the new movement. With the large growth of population in the nineteenth century the influence of these new social conditions has not been without its influence on the Roman Church. Many practices are favored to give a popular color to a religion professed by the masses. New forms of devotion have been introduced with great applause, such as the Sacred Heart and the Cult of St. Joseph. Pilgrimages to miraculous shrines are encouraged where wonder-cures are performed. Much of this new propaganda is connected with the surprising growth of religious orders in recent times. Old communities have been restored and new ones organized; more particularly has this expansion been noticed in the case of orders for women. In Paris in 1864 there were nineteen orders for men with twenty-three houses, while there were thirty-nine for wonen with fifty-five houses. By 1892, when the city had grown in population half as much again, there were one hundred and thirty-four houses for men and nearly five hundred and fifty for women; and throughout the whole of France in 1901 there were four times as many nuns as there had been at the outbreak of the revolution in 1789. Even in

Protestant Prussia there were in 1896 about fourteen hundred houses with a membership of nearly twenty thousand.

Calvinism

Of the two great remaining confessional divisions of Western Christendom, Calvinism showed the greatest power of expansion after the close of the era of religious revolution. The reason for this capacity for growth may be sought for in the fact that it became indigenous in the most progressive countries in Europe, and especially attained predominant influence in England and Holland, which developed into great maritime powers. It was strengthened, too, by its clear, dogmatic formularies, by its vigorous political ideals and organization and by its encouragement of a warlike, conquering spirit modelled on Old Testament precedents. What it could accomplish may be seen in the successful struggle against overwhelming odds in Holland when that state won its independence from the Spanish monarchy, and also in the obstinate maintenance by Scottish Presbyterians of their autonomy in the long struggle with the Stuarts. In Switzerland Calvinism supplanted Zwinglianism, and in the most progressive districts of Germany, Lutheranism. The most conspicuous successes in this last field were the conversion of the Elector of Brandenburg and the entire religious control of the Palatinate. Even in Poland a part of the nobility and some of the cities adopted the French reformers'

creed, while some of the Magyars took the same step, though the German districts in Hungary adopted Lutheranism.

After attaining this cosmopolitan position in Europe, Calvinists came to occupy the newly founded possessions of England in America. In the southern colonies the Anglican Church prevailed in districts where there were large estates. Separated from them by the Dutch settlements, the New England communities grew up composed of artisans, merchants and yeomen of austere Puritan stock, who had fled from home because of the religious policy of the Stuarts. These settlements developed into Non-conformist colonies, endowed by royal charters with the most extensive privileges of free government. In polity the New England Church was congregationalist, but the line between State and Church was vaguely drawn, for the State was entrusted with large powers in maintaining dogma and morals in accordance with the strictest Calvinistic tenets. The more regularly organized Calvinists, the American Presbyterians, are due to a much later wave of immigration of Scotch and Irish settlers. Along with these must be enumerated the immigrants of Calvinistic training from Holland, the Palatinate and France, who all coöporated to create a sturdy, freedom-loving and strictly orthodox type of society wherever they made their home.

The theocratic ideals of Calvinism tended to strong organization with detailed disciplinary supervision: the Church is the community of the elect in this

world, ruled over by Christ in heaven. It does not consist in institutions or in means of grace, but is found in the persons of the elect acting under supernatural control, to the exclusion of all human instruments. This community, being the form in which salvation is presented, is governed directly by the Bible; officers in Church and State are coördinate organs of control, but they must show their ability to stand the scriptural test in the exercise of their functions. As to unbelievers, they must be held in subjection and the reality of a visible, concrete community of saints is kept intact. Reliance on secular authority was deeply rooted in the Calvinistic theocracy, but the secular authority must be faithful to the standards imposed by the community: it was bound to support the Church "where the pure word of God was preached"; in secular things it was sovereign over the clergy and had the final decision in cases of doubt because of its Christian character; it was also expected to use its police power and its financial resources to support the Church.

The closest realization of these ideals was found in Geneva, in Scotland, and in New England. In France Calvinism had on its hands a conflict with an antagonistic State, where the Church had provisionally to organize itself until the "godless" sovereign power could be convinced of its error. Here the principle was recognized that by the exercise of the sovereignty of a people themselves Christian a sinful ruler might be supplanted. In Holland the rigorous sys-

tem was markedly attenuated because of the political and economic environment. The House of Orange itself never permitted clerical supremacy, with the result that real toleration came to be practised, although the early leaders of liberalism, men such as Barneveldt and Grotius, found their attacks on the strict Calvinistic party a costly experiment. Even in New England, as time went on, the rigorist standards were softened to something resembling toleration, because of religious variations in the several colonies.

In public worship Calvinism followed the most radical model. The Church became a meeting-house. The æsthetic appeal was altogether rejected. No feast days were permitted but Sunday, and Sunday itself became identical with the Jewish Sabbath. One of the most important adjuncts of the Calvinistic polity was its educational system to which the Genevan reformer himself had given great attention. This model was followed both in the Huguenot academies and, in a more important development, by the "Reformed" universities of Holland; conspicuous among them being the great citadel of Humanism, Leyden, where during the seventeenth century scholars of international reputation found the most congenial atmosphere in Europe.

Lutheranism

After the long period of conflict which was not closed until the conclusion of the Thirty Years' War, the Lutheran Church remained true to its original type.

Doctrinally it developed into a hard-and-fast neo-Scholasticism. Its dogmatic system was formulated with the purpose of bringing out sharply its antagonism to Tridentine and Calvinistic formulas. Absolute uniformity of belief was insisted upon, and though the aim seemed impossible of realization, because of the subtlety of the theological disputes in which trained experts could alone formulate opinions, elaborate doctrinal statements were prepared to which subscription was demanded from pastors and teachers. Among the rank and file of church members the influence of this atmosphere may be seen in the extraordinary attention paid to catechetical literature.

In public worship the preaching office was the important factor; just as the priest under the old system was the dispenser of the sacrament, under the new he dispensed the mystery of salvation as revealed in the Scriptures. In public worship the conservative tendencies of Luther were continued and many elements of the old service were retained, provided they did not directly interfere with his postulate that salvation comes through the Bible alone. The old calendar and lectionary were preserved; laying on of hands in ordination by presbyters was continued. Both the rite of confirmation and also the practice of confession were features of the religious custom of the Church, even if dogmatically these usages were not given the historical interpretation of other ages. In the celebration of the Communion not a few of the liturgical customs of the Mass were kept up, and in

the Order for Baptism the exorcism was still included. Much attention was given to music, especially the congregational singing of hymns.

In its ecclesiastical administration the Lutheran churches, territorially organized as they were, stood under the supervision of the sovereign of the territory. All real autonomy of the Church disappeared; its affairs were administered under the direction of secular princes, and this principle was ultimately extended to decisions on matters of faith. There was no conception of a Lutheran Church extending beyond fixed territorial divisions. The essential feature of Lutheranism is the isolated local Church, whose limits were decided by the extent of territory ruled over by a particular territorial prince. This represented Luther's own ideal; he had more confidence in princes than either in a Christian democracy or an oligarchy made up of nobles or even clerics. The Church was ruled by a mixed commission composed of lawyers and theologians acting under the authority of the State. The function of the clerical members was to offer correct interpretations of the Bible so that questions of discipline and administration might be decided according to the orthodox standards of Christian enlightenment. Under the influence of these legal interpreters the theory came to be accepted that the territorial sovereign had virtually inherited all that was implied in the previously existing episcopal jurisdiction.

It was sometime before these rigid lines of Lu-

theran orthodoxy were broken by a revolt, which is in some ways analogous to the Wesleyan movement in England. The leader of this new direction was Ph. J. Spener, who, beginning in Frankfort, organized groups of disciples to meet together for devotional exercises. Opposition was not wanting in orthodox circles. Spener, after being driven from Saxony, took refuge in Berlin, where he was given an official position, and his followers, Francke and Anton, received chairs in the newly founded University of Halle, where the influence of Pietism continued to predominate for two centuries. In the nineteenth century the status of Lutheranism was radically effected by a union with the Calvinists (1817), which was supported by the Prussian government; many Lutherans refused to abide by the state-enforced compact, and after some years of obstinate resistance were, in 1841, given legal recognition by Prussia. Since this period, owing to the strong partisan organization of German Roman Catholics, more or less successful attempts have been made to induce all German Protestants to act together, using as a common ground of union such foundations as the Gustavus Adolphus Society and the Evangelical Alliance; their propaganda is especially directed against the Centre or Roman Catholic party.

Missionary Expansion

In missionary expansion, the primary place was taken for some time by the Roman Catholic com-

munion which, through its religious orders, especially the Jesuits and Capuchins, made a systematic effort to undertake the work of conversion in the new lands opened up for European occupation by Spanish and Portuguese explorers. In 1622 the Congregation De Propaganda Fide was given general supervision of missionary work; soon special institutions for training missionaries were founded in Rome and Paris. The native races of America found worthy champions of their rights against the atrocities of the sixteenth century colonial system in the early missionaries: among whom Las Casas deserves chief mention for his intelligent and unremitting effort to protect the American Indians. Christianity made not only noteworthy advance in the western hemisphere, but also in the Philippine Islands, which, after their occupation by Spain in 1571, soon became largely Christianized. India was visited by St. Francis Xavier, whose work there was at first crowned by great success. Later an attempt was made through the so-called "accommodation" system to take account of the native prejudices, due to their religious traditions, and certain ceremonial practices were altered to reconcile the Hindoos to the new faith. These compromises were bitterly opposed by the Capuchins, and finally by an authoritative decree from Rome (1744) the Jesuit methods of conversion were condemned. In Japan Jesuit missionaries made numerous converts; as many as 200,000 are reckoned before the close of the sixteenth century. After a hard struggle for existence the Chris-

tian community was finally annihilated in 1638, largely through the intrigues of Dutch traders, who saw in the persecution of the Christians the best method of removing their rivals, the Portuguese, from the country. In China the Jesuits, because of their attainments in science and education, had success with the court circles. They practised here also the tenets of "accommodation", but without gaining any large number of converts. Finally, whatever advantages the system secured were lost when it was condemned by the pope, and also when the anti-foreign animus of the government becaue intensified. With the religious revival of the nineteenth century the Roman Communion has shown admirable devotion to the missionary cause. Numerous societies have been formed to encourage the work, and many new institutions opened for training missionaries. In India and in China the number of native Roman Catholic Christians is far in excess of the adherents of any other religious organization, and in many cases missionary expansion has been accomplished in the face of heartrending persecution.

It was long before the sectarian spirit, called into being by the revolution of the sixteenth century, could be so far overcome that the universal obligation of missionary work was recognized. With the increased attention given to colonial expansion the need of looking after the spiritual welfare of the native inhabitants of the new world could no longer be disregarded. In the days of the Long Parliament the

famous "Society for the Propagation of the Gospel" was established, which contributed to support work among the Indians in the American colonies. Later in the Queen Anne period it was largely concerned with providing churches and clergy for the English colonists. In our own day the chief work of the Society is the support of mission stations in all the lands where gentile religions still prevail. One of the results of the Evangelical Revival was the foundation in 1799 of a missionary organization which became in a few years the Church Missionary Society that to-day controls admirably administered mission stations in many parts of the world. At about the same time the London Missionary Society was founded as a method to induce evangelical communions, to concentrate their efforts in common on the religious uplift of non-Christian people. With these organizations taking the lead similar societies came into being during the course of the nineteenth century, both on the continent of Europe and in America.

The bare statistics of contributions for administrative expenses alone give no idea of the kind of work accomplished, nor can it be even measured by the visible results in conversions. One can only estimate the product of missionary expansion when it is studied in the lives of the men and women who have taken up the work. Plenty of mistakes have been made; numerous have been the examples of crude prepration and inadequate vision, but on the whole the cumulative effect of the types of personality represented in

all the various phases of missionary zeal is irresistible. No one can read the lives of Xavier, of Livingstone, of Cary and of Patterson, without being convinced that new standards of heroism have been created.

As yet the results may not seem adequate to the expenditure of effort. Still the territories covered have been immeasurably greater than those ever before opened up for missionary expanison. And the difficulties also have been immeasurably greater; peoples, in various stages of culture and with antecedent histories which are often the puzzle of the anthropologist, have had preached to them a message which has meant the unfolding of new hope and of undreamed possibilities. It is coming to be seen that the bare record of adherents or communicants cannot actually represent what Christian missions have accomplished. It cannot be questioned that the unique period of transition now being ushered in for races previously isolated and backward is clearly to be traced to the ever widening power of the forces originating the great Christian society of which the missionary is the pioneer.

American Christianity

The religious development of America was directly conditioned by the forms and structure of colonial life. Its ecclesiastical history for some time was but the replica of home influence, whether the colony was closely bound to the mother country or stimulated by the free-

dom of colonial autonomy. The Anglican Church grew to be the established Church in many of the colonies where the founders did not come from the rigid Puritan stock that took refuge on the New England coast. Work on a large scale was not contemplated; the needs of the colonists, who themselves showed little activity, prompted the formation of a parish system worked along the conventional lines and modelled from the agricultural communities in the mother country. When with the growth of the population a more centralized and regular organization was demanded, the project of founding dioceses with bishops at their head was opposed both in the colonies and in England, largely on political grounds. The Church under the Hanoverian monarchy was in too lethargic a state to attempt an original campaign of expansion in behalf of its members across the Atlantic, especially when only a few American Churchmen looked beyond their own parochial boundaries. Yet under such conditions adherents were gained and new parishes started by the help of the London Society for the Propagation of the Gospel even in colonies where Anglicans did not have the privilege of state establishment, which they enjoyed in Maryland, Virginia, and other southern provinces.

When independence was proclaimed and won by a tedious and hardly contested war, the Anglican Church suffered more than the material losses due to the confiscation of its property where it had been established. Its clergy for the most part and many

of its laity were colonial loyalists; of these large numbers had left the country with the result that churches were left empty without pastoral supervision. The era of reconstruction was painful, and during it many were the crises to which the new order gave rise. Bishops were finally secured from Scotland and England, the Prayer Book was revised in a conservative spirit, and with a carefully drawn constitution and canons the transformed Colonial Church proved its ability and right to survive, burdened though it was with an uninspiring past in America and stamping itself officially with the name 'Protestant Episcopal', a title which recalls only the tactless religious compromises dear to Georgian England. A small, inconspicuous rôle, in fact, must be assigned as an organization to American Anglicanism during these early years. Its chief glory and title to fame comes not from its administration as a corporate power, but because through it many of the men who founded the new Republic received their religious nurture. Weak as it was and commonplace as were its achievements, it retained the affectionate respect of men such as Washington, Hamilton, and Madison; and narrow though the field may have been, White and Seabury, the Church's earliest bishops, were leaders of high character and capacity.

American religious history during the eighteenth century in its wider appeal becomes illuminating, because it may be said without indulging in paradox, that its religious activity presaged in a way America's economic and social originality, both traits that are its

recognized features in the nineteenth century. Industrially the colonial world was one of routine; yet religiously the New England Revival, with which the name of Jonathan Edwards is connected, was at the time a unique phenomenon from the scale of its extension and also in its intensity of feeling. Large accessions of labor power was coming in with immigration from the Old World. Unlike as were the eighteenth century immigrants from those of the previous century, the principle of self-help showed itself as the foundation of American life in the way in which strange surroundings were made to serve the purpose of religious organizations of a new type. The attitude of protest against a State-encouraged ecclesiastical order was no longer dominant; expansion, not sectarian bitterness, became the characteristic of American Christianity. Bodies small on the European side of the Atlantic became strongest in the number of adherents; such as the Baptists, who in a unique way showed on American soil that a compact religious force could be created without any centralized organization. Equally remarkable was the spread of Methodism, which demonstrated by its American experience that the personal force of a great religious leader can be translated into an organization powerfully knit together, in which the personal factors of leadership are altogether subordinate to an admirably conceived model of ecclesiastical administration.

Such was the preparation for the religious life of America during the nineteenth century. The mar-

vellous growth of the country in population supplied the field in which these forces were to work. It took some time before the obstacles which impeded the growth of the Anglican Church were overcome. The advance in church extension became noticeable after the third decade of the century. New dioceses came into existence and in the older ones, notably in New York under the leadership of Bishop Hobart, the old tradition which aimed solely at preserving "those things which remain" were definitely abandoned for an aggressive programme. Vantage points were occupied, with the result that in the eastern section of the country a strong position was secured, especially in the cities and larger towns. In the Middle West less enterprise was shown, with the result that in the new, rapidly growing states the representatives of the Church were unable to gather about them large numbers of adherents. In a whole tier of dioceses, centring about the Mississippi Valley, this inability to plan an aggressive campaign when it was needed has left as its inheritance a zone where the number of communicants in proportion to the population is extremely small and the existing rate of increase is slow. Further west a wiser statesmanship prevailed. As the more distant states were settled provision was made systematically for church extension. Through its administrative machinery the whole territory of the United States is now occupied. Statistically judged by its weak beginning, the position of the Anglican Church is strong, for it numbers on its

lists more than a hundred bishops, over five thousand clergy and nearly a million actual communicants. The era of partisan strife has happily passed away, and some of the evils of an exaggerated parochialism and a short-sighted provincialism have been overcome, as is witnessed to-day by the interest taken in promoting the programme of the Board of Missions. In concerns of internal development, amidst the mass of details, one cannot fail to single out as of vital moment the rapid reunion of the two sections of the Church after the close of the Civil War, the ability of its organization to resist the schismatic movement in the seventies that led to the formation of the Reformed Episcopal Church, and, finally, the long-continued process of Prayer Book revision which, though hardly satisfactory to the liturgical expert, represents a conscientious and conservative attempt to deal with a thorny problem.

In the face of the manifold divisions in American religious life one might be tempted to adopt a critical attitude toward its whole evolution as merely a phenomenon showing lost opportunities and ineffective effort. In the life of no one communion is there condensed the complete spiritual vitality of the nation, nor indeed in the sum of the several fragments can there be revealed the achievements or the aims of the Christian social conscience. Much beneficent activity is made impossible by the limitations imposed through the existence of organizations which tend to an almost infinite reduplication of officers and institu-

tions over a common territory. The fact that so much good can be done under a regime of denominational difference and misunderstanding that would seem unworkable if an analogous system were adopted in the civil government of a modern state, shows how strong are the sources of man's spiritual energy. The achievements of American Christianity are, however, visible not only in church buildings, hospitals, educational institutions, philanthropic societies of all kinds and purposes, but just as much in the way in which Americans, though they are severed in their confessional allegiance, have learned to live together in harmony and work together to secure the common aims of Christian civilization.

Through its freedom from the State, American Christianity had before it a wide field for experimentation. The position was a novel one, for the records of church history prove how much incident and stimulus have come through association with the State or by opposition to state control. Now that this point of contact was absent it was a question whether the American communions would accept the subordinate ideals of non-conforming bodies in Europe or whether they would maintain that virile corporate self-consciousness which seemed to belong historically to the state connection. The potent factor controlling the evolution of American Christianity was primarily due to the enormous accession of new territory that came to the United States as the result of the Louisiana purchase. The days of small things

inherited from the Colonial period were bound to give way with the era of immigration into the newly opened western territories. The opportunity of their occupatoin was eagerly seized by the Baptists and the Methodists. It was estimated that at the beginning of the century most of the Virginia Baptists had migrated to Kentucky, and the actual expansion of Methodism throughout the newly opened West can only be paralleled in modern times by the rapid advance made by the Russian Church in the tribes of Central Asia. Under the inspiration of this great westward impulse a new movement of awakening began. Its centre was in the backwoods and among frontier populations. The pioneer communities of the West were shaken by a wave of emotionalism which left as a permanent endowment the "camp-meeting" and which produced new sectarian organizations, giving a primary place to the phenomena of conversion.

The practical trend of American religious life soon proved itself able to overcome a purely individualistic theory. Missionary boards were established by all the important evangelical communions. Under the leadership of Judson the American Baptists, who even in the early days of the nineteenth century numbered as many as 200,000 communicants, prepared for an active campaign of missionary work. Their example was soon followed by others. Questions nearer at home began to be actively taken up by the collective Christian conscience of the land. Duelling, the treatment of the Indians, the existence of slavery, the

need of temperance reform, all of these were subjects in which the conflicts of sectarianism were transcended, and the effect of cumulative pressure produced far-reaching results in all those American Churches that had drawn to them the loyal allegiance of the masses of the population.

Various societies devoted to religion and philanthropy witnessed to the common serious purpose of evangelization (American Bible Society 1816, American Tract Society 1825, Seamen's Friend Society 1826). In pioneer work throughout the rapidly growing states of the Middle West the Methodists and Baptists took and retained an acknowledged lead. The Presbyterians who had held a strong position in the early days of the republic dropped behind, because their forward movement was impeded by schismatic dissensions and also because in novel social conditions their system proved inelastic. The Congregationalists, strongly rooted in New England traditions, remained true to the rock from which they were hewn and did valiant service in founding colleges, seminaries and in encouraging religious journalism. Discussions concerning the moral position of slavery had brought about sectional divisions among the Baptists and Methodists some time before the Civil War. At its outbreak the Presbyterians also formed northern and southern organizations.

From small inconspicuous beginnings the American Roman Catholics have grown into the strongest communion numerically in the United States. Their

growth is a part of the economic history of the country, so intimately is it related to the demand for labor in the newly opened fields of industry in all its forms. Though a peoples' Church, it maintains in a democracy the rigid standards of autocratic rule. Yet in a democratic environment there have been many modifications of the rigidity which characterizes the ultramontanism of continental Europe. The self-help of American life has been appropriated with an energy and shrewdness that have enabled the authorities of the Church to accomplish results in church expansion that would have puzzled any college of cardinals, even if presented as a programme of remote possibilities. Dominated by the Celtic element, largely because the Irish laborer was the first to answer the call of the New World in an era of unparalleled material development, the American Roman Catholics have been protected from serious racial dissensions among their adherents simply through the rapid process of social assimilation which takes place on the American soil. All the religious institutional life of the Old World which is there so carefully supervised by the State in the countries where Roman Catholics are in the majority has been transplanted to America where the Church is allowed free and unrestricted autonomous privileges. An independent educational system has been created which permits the Church to train its adherents according to the fixed standards of ecclesiastical loyalty without interference from the secular authorities. From every point of view the experiment is

a novel one; a religious communion which condemns the principle of a free Church in a free State has demonstrated its rights to exist and grow in a country which recognizes no relationship between citizenship and confessional allegiance.

On a smaller scale the American Lutherans have received large increments from the successive waves of immigration in the nineteenth century. Their growth in membership is clearly connected with the accessions due to the settlers from Germany and Scandinavia. Loosely organized, the Lutheran Church in America has hardly shown the vigor that might be expected from its favored position as the natural home of so many new-comers from the lands of northern Europe.

From the first Calvinism controlled the religious thought of America, and much of the internal history of its strongest religious bodies has been influenced by controversies regarding the limits of Calvinistic orthodoxy. New separatist movements have followed these discussions, and frequently the separation has maintained itself long after the original causes of dissension were forgotten or removed. The Universalists and the Disciples are clearly the offsprings of revolt from the iron hand of the Geneva reformer. Though Calvinism has disintegrated, these "*protestant*" movements are bound by the term of their original charter to treat it by a kind of legal fiction as still dominant in the bodies from which they separated. American Unitarianism attests the vitality of Christian ethics long after Christian dogma has been cast

aside. The record of Unitarians in philanthropy, in civic idealism and social altruism should weigh heavily in the scale whenever one is tempted to define their position by their own persistant but unsuccessful attempts to separate themselves from historical Christianity.

The Eastern Church

A French historical scholar has adopted the term 'cesaro-papalism' to indicate the type of ecclesiastical administration by which the Eastern Church was controlled. The phrase is equally suggestive historically, since the fortunes of the Eastern Church were closely bound up with the vicissitudes of the Roman Empire in the East. As the Empire dwindled away in the face of the attacks of Islam,— first at the hands of the Caliphate and the Emirates,— and then continued a weak and pitiable existence after the brutal and ill-considered assaults of the western crusaders, so the Church in the East was disintegrated and paralyzed by the hapless fate of the civil power. Large members of Christians must have become Moslems, those who were faithful were exposed to the incessant wearing away of hope and energy in an intolerable isolation. Vigorous elements were added by the accession of the Slavonic races in the stages of conversion and expansion previously noted in these pages. But even here development was arrested in these new national churches by conquerors of alien race. In the Balkan Peninsula the Slav peoples had in the end to

submit to the Turkish yoke. From this time on the Eastern Church outside Russia was an organization under the supervision of a Mohammedan sultanate, which used it as a convenient instrument for governing its Christian subjects. This degrading patronage was as disastrous as the crude repression always exercised by the Turk against any Christians who failed to accept the stagnation and corruption of Ottoman rule.

Dean Church has given in his *Gifts of Civilization* a beautiful description of the survival of Christian character, of the permanence of Christian steadfastness among the lowly victims of this Turkish conquest. His plea may outweigh the disgust excited by the story of Phanariot intrigues, the squabbles of commonplace venal patriarchs and bishops, and may enable us with an easy conscience to pass over the interminable and unprofitable dialectical disputes burdening a church, the members of which were treated no better than helots. Only in the nineteenth century has a better day dawned. Greece again became free, and in course of time as Turkish domination collapsed the Slavonic peoples in southern Europe gained along with political independence religious autonomy. Byzantine traditions are still prevalent; all of these churches are national in a sense unrealized in western Europe. Cesaro-papalism in another form flourishes, the only protection against it being the general antipathy of the Slav to allow his logic to iterfere with his imagination and his emotions. In the Hel-

lenic Kingdom itself a measure of autonomy is enjoyed by the Church, as something of the old spirit of the Greek democracy has revived. In all these countries the Church of the land is the Church of the masses of the people. Dissent exists only on a limited scale; clericalism is unknown because the clergy do not control the Church. Without formal bonds of union and with no desire to create a mechanism for coöperation the Christian peoples of southern Europe, separated as they are by speech and tradition, are conscious of a community of faith and doctrine which gives them a genuine if still imperfect basis of common action in the religious sphere. Racial antagonism is still active, and in the East it often produces results more disastrous to the ideals of Christian amity than the sectarianism of the Occident.

From small beginnings the Russian Church has come to cover a territory of immense geographic extent; with its membership of over eighty millions it far exceeds in size any other National Church. Its advance has coincided with the phenomenal expansion of Russia as a political power in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Cesaro-papalism in Russia has produced a type of Christian allegiance due to Slavonic environment that is hard for Western Christians who have gone through an entirely different historical development to appreciate or understand. When one turns to the early period of the Russian Church the initial illumination comes from looking at the map of mediæval Europe. Poland, not Russia, was

the predominant Slavonic power. The domains under Russian control were of comparatively small extent. With the Mongol invasion, which resulted in an occupation of over two hundred years, the Church as well as the State suffered from the oversight of their pagan conquerors, although in no sense could the policy of Genghis Khan and his successors be called a persecution applied after the familiar model of Western Christendom. As autonomy in a rough way was conceded, an opportunity was given for the growth of a national consciousness by which the Russian State was consolidated and the Russian Church became inspired with a national sentiment and refused vigorously the suggestion of submission to Roman claims made by its metropolitan at the Council of Florence. Even dependence on Constantinople was abandoned after the conquest of the capital of the Eastern Empire by the Ottomans, with the result that the supremacy of the grand dukes in ecclesiastical affairs became complete.

While the onward sweep of the Turk turned the Christian powers of southern Europe into a status of dependency, in Russia Mongol domination disappeared through the victories of the Turks over the Mongols in Asia. All the events, political and religious, which tended to weaken the states adjacent to the territory of the Russian grand dukes concurred to promote the growth of their own power. It is no accident that the age of Ivan the Terrible, the champion of Russian consolidation, coincides with the period of Elizabeth

of England and Henry IV of France. While in western Europe the taste for exact theological formulas was being gratified by the Council of Trent and in the countless Lutheran and Reformed confessions, the Russian Church, isolated as it was, did not escape this influence. Indeed, Anglicans in their satisfaction with the Thirty-nine Articles may envy the Russian Church, because its synod of 1551 published a Book of a Hundred Chapters prescribing rules of discipline and reform. Foreign influences of a direct kind were resisted with an aggressiveness that recalls the national stand taken by Tudor England, a trait which comes out plainly when attempts were made by the Jesuits to introduce a pro-papal movement in the immediate territory of the grand dukes. Roman supremacy might have been introduced without the enforcement of Latin customs and ritual.

In 1589 an independent patriarch of Russia was consecrated to enable Moscow to take its place along with the three historic eastern patriarchal sees with no thinly veiled intention that the original number lessened by the defection of Rome might be restored. The plan for a time worked well under the early Romanoffs, who were careful to see that the occupant of the patriarchal throne was willing to coöperate with the governing power in the State. New influences were brought to bear upon the Russian Church: western methods of theological thought began to be appreciated and used in a way that stimulated discussion. Peter Mogila, who had studied at the Sorbonne

and was later Metropolitan of Kief, prepared a confession of the Orthodox Faith which was later accepted as authoritative by the Synod of Bethlehem on the occasion of the famous dispute in regard to the Eucharistic doctrine of the Eastern Church (1672). In Russia itself the commanding ecclesiastical figure of the seventeenth century was the patriarch Nicon, who went to work with impartial thoroughness to introduce discipline and order among the clergy. A Greek by birth and training, it is not surprising that he took as his model the church administration of Constantinople. All went well until the service books were cleared of traditional errors. Nicon cared as little for prejudices as Laud, with the result that over questions of such really subordinate importance as service book revision and minor ceremonial acts, a serious and enduring schism destroyed the religious unity of the country. Nicon's reforms were accepted, but he fell a victim to the dislike his domineering temper had created in the governing classes, passing his closing years in a monastery.

It was this example of patriarchal autocracy that induced Peter the Great to abolish the Moscow Patriarchate and substitute for it a Holy Governing Synod where no one individual prelate could withstand the will of the Czar, who was himself represented by an official procurator appointed to validate the acts and decrees of the clerical members. The scheme of Peter the Great has demonstrated the accuracy of the Czar's forecast, though the reason given by him that the gov-

ernment by many is less liable to error than a monarchical government, must be regarded as hardly an accepted truism in Russian secular life. Since the eighteenth century the occidentalizing of Russia has in no way signified that the National Church has lost its hold upon the people, nor does it mean that there has been felt any need to modify its doctrinal position inherited from its early associations with the Greek-speaking world. Conservatism prevails, as it might be expected to prevail among a population almost entirely occupied with agricultural pursuits, carried on in a structure of society still primitively ordered.

With the rivalry of the Great Powers under a tense system of armed peace the deep-rooted attachment to nationality in all its forms has contributed to preserve the integrity of the Church, even though in the restricted group who appreciate and who produce the masterpieces of Russian modern literature there are strong anti-clerical sympathies. In the higher clergy education has advanced, spurred by the desire to give the representatives of the Church a position where scholarship can count in the contact with western thought. In its attitude towards the Roman Communion this same self-conscious strength has done more than resist advances for an understanding based solely on the sentiment of historical continuity: many adherents of the Uniat compromise, which accepts papal autonomy under reservations of states rights as to language and ritual, have been restored to the communion of the Orthodox Church.

That the strength of Russian Christianity cannot be explained by insisting on the superficial advantages secured by state connection is evident when the record of Russian missions in the nineteenth century is brought under review. Russian national expansion in Eastern Asia dates from the reign of Ivan the Terrible. By 1697, i.e. a little more than a century after Ivan's death, territories eight or ten times as large as Russia had been annexed to the Empire. This immense territory offered serious problems to the extension of the Christian religion. The native tribes were different in language, religious beliefs, and in racial origin. They were scattered in small isolated groups over lands difficult of access. Philotheus, Metropolitan of Tobolsk from 1702 to 1727, had a diocese of 300,000 square miles in which there were but 160 churches. It is estimated that under his directions between forty and fifty thousand natives were converted to Christianity. Most of the missionary work at this period was in the hands of monastic communities, the members of which were examples of zeal, but only a few showed originality in dealing with the complexities due to the social and racial traditions of the Siberian tribes. Crude types of paganism flourished, while some tribes had advanced to the level of Lamaism and Mohammedanism.

In the nineteenth century systematic work on a large scale was perfected and has been carried out. Schools have been established, but the principle of

racial integrity has been carefully preserved, though through the fostering of the native languages in which religious and secular instruction has been given, Macarius' mission among the pagan Altai shows how successful as a principle missionary conservation can be made. Out of the 45,000 native inhabitants, 25,000 are already Christian. Among the Tartars who had accepted only a nominal form of Christianity while practically remaining Moslems, Ilminski (d. 1891) achieved remarkable results by making a careful study of their racial and linguistic peculiarities. By his painstaking labor native teachers have been trained for missionary schools, while a native clergy has been organized to do pastoral work in the village churches.

Kazan is an important centre of missionary propaganda; from it have come translations of religious books in twenty native languages, while in the Kazan Ecclesiatical Academy special courses lasting two years are offered to those who wish to devote themselves to missionary work. All missionary direction is in the hands of the Orthodox Missionary Society. Its statistical records (1870-1899) show 124,204 baptisms administered in a period of thirty years, although the amount contributed annually—a specimen year (1899) during the period gives $125,00 — is not large according to occidental standards. The Russian Church does important work beyond the confines of the Empire, notably in Japan, but its sphere at home virtually demands its direct attention. According to

the last available statistics, within the territorial bounds under its administration are fourteen million Moslems, four hundred and thirty thousand Buddhists, and nearly three hundred thousand adherents of paganism; the orthodox population of the Empire itself is nealy ninety millions.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

GENERAL WORKS

Benigni: Storia sociale della chiesa.

Bernheim, E.: Lehrbuch der historischen methode.

Cabrol, F.: Dictionnaire de l'archéologie Chrétienne.

Cambridge Mediæval History.

Carlyle, R. R., and Carlyle, A. J.: A History of Mediæval Political Theory in the West.

Döllinger: Akademische Vorträge (Eng. trans.).

Dunbar, A. B. S.: Dictionary of Saintly Women.

Ebert: Allg Geschichte der Litteratur im Mittelalter.

Ficker, J.: Forschungen zur Reichs und Rechtsgeschichte Italiens.

Freeman: Historical Essays.

Gee and Hardy: Documents illustrative of English Church History.

Gregorovius: Geschichte der Stadt Rom (Eng. trans. by Bell).

Harnack: Dogmen Geschichte (Eng. trans.).

Hauck-Herzog: Real encyclopædie für Protestantische Theologie (abridged Eng. trans.).

Hauck: Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands.

Hastings: Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics.

Hefele, C. S.: Konzilien Geschichte.

Hergenröther, J. A. G.: Kirchengeschichte (ed. Kirsch, J. P.).

Heussi, K.: Kompendium der Kirchengeschichte.

Heussi und Mulert: Altas zur Kirchengeschichte.

Hinneberg, P.: Kultur der Gegenwart; Geschichte der Christlichen Religion (by Müller, Ehrhard and Troeltsch).

Hutton, W. H. (editor): The Church Universal.

Jaffé: Regesta Pontificum.

Kehr, P. F.: Regesta Pontificum Romanorum.

Krüger, M. G.: Handbuch der Kirchengeschichte.

Lavisse, E.: Histoire de France.

Manitius, Max: Geschichte der Lateinischen Litteratur des Mittelalters.

Mirbt, C.: Quellen zur Geschichte des Papsttums.

Möller, W.: Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte (new ed. by von Schubert u. Kawerau).

Mourret, F.: Histoire Génèrale de l'Église.

Olland, S. L.: Dictionary of English Church History.

Plummer, A., and Gee, H., and others: Handbooks of English Church History.

Political History of England (ed. by Hunt).

Potthast, A.: Biblioteca Historica Medii Ævi.

Ranke: Weltgeschichte.

Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart.

Roman Catholic Encyclopædia (Robert Appleton, N. Y.).

Ruffini: Religious Liberty.

Smet, de C.: Introductio ad Historiam Ecclesiasticam.

Stephens and Hunt (editors): History of the English Church.

Stubbs: Lectures on Mediæval and Modern History.

Thomassinus, L.: Vetus et Nova Disciplina.

CHAPTER I

Agnellus: Liber Pontificalis Ecclesiæ Ravennatis (ed. Holder-Egger).

Alivisatos: Die Kirchliche Gestzgebung des Kaisers Justinian I.

Berr: Die Kirche gegenuber Gewaltthaten von Laien (from Merovingian times).

Boundinhon, B. A.: Sur l'histoire de la pénitence (Revue d'histoire et de littérature religieuse 11, 1897).

Bréhaut, E.: Encyclopedist of the Dark Ages, Isidore of Seville.

Bright, W.: Chapters on Early English Church History.

Bury: St. Patrick.

Bury: Later Roman Empire.

Crivellucci: Storia delle Relazioni tra lo Stato e la Chiesa.

Duchesne, L.: Vigile et Pélage: Rev Questions Historiques 1884.

Duchesne, L.: Christian Worship.

Duchesne: Liber Pontificalis.

Diehl, Ch.: Justinien.
Dudden, F. G.: Gregory the Great.
Freeman: Western Europe in the Fifth Century.
Gams, P. G.: Kirchengeschichte Spaniens.
Gelzer, H.: Byzantinische Kulturgeschichte.
Gougaud, L.: Les Chrétientés Celtiques.
Gregory of Tours: German translation by Hellman, S.; Latin text by Omont.
Grisar, H.: Geschichte Roms und der Päpste im Mittelalter (Eng. trans.).
Gundlach, W.: Die Entstehung des Kirchenstaates.
Hartmann, L. M.: Ein Kapital vom Spätantiken und fruh-mittelalterlichen Staate; Geschichte Italiens; Der untergang der Antiken Welt.
Hodgkin: Italy and Her Invaders.
Holmes, T. S.: Origin and Development of the Christian Church in Gaul during the first six centuries.
Howarth, H. H.: Gregory the Great, and Birth of the English Church.
Huart, C.: Histoire des Arabes.
Jonas: Vita Columbani.
Joyce, P. W.: Social History of Ancient Ireland.
Kurth, G.: Clovis.
Labourt, J.: Le Christianisme dans l'Empire Perse sous la Dynastie Sassanide.
Lane-Pool, S.: Islam.
Leclercq: L'Espagne Chrétienne.
Levison, W.: Die Iren und die Frankische; Kirche Hist. Zeitschrift, 1912.
Mabillon: Annales Ord. S. Benedicti; Acta Sanctorum O. S. B.
Macler, F.: Histoire d'Héraclius par l'Évéque Sebèos.
Maguin: L'Église Viségothique au VII Siecle.
Malfatti, B.: Imperatori e Pape.
Margoliuth: Mohammed.
Martroye, F.: L'Occident a l'Époque Byzantine.
Müller, A.: Islam im Morgen und Abendland.
Norden, W.: Papsttum und Byzanz.
Plummer, C.: Vitæ Sanctorum Hiberniæ.

Rauschen, B. G.: Eucharistie und Busskrament in den erster sechs Jahrhunderten der Kirche.

Savio, F.: Gli Antichi Vescovi d'Italia dalle Origini al 1300.

Sesan: Kirche und Staat im Römisch Byzantinischen Reiche.

Stuhlfath: Gregor I der Grosse, sein Leben bis zu seiner Wahl zum Papste.

Teano Principe di: Annali d'Islam, and Cronographia (a continuation of the Annali).

Tarducci: Storia di San Gregoro Magno e del suo tempo.

Tillemont: Mémoires pour servir a l'histoire Écclésiastique.

Todd: Ireland and the Celtic Church.

Zimmer: The Celtic Church, art in Hauck-Herzog (trans. by Miss Meyer).

CHAPTER II

Bonneau, A.: La Donation de Constantine (containing Laurentius Valla's treatise).

Bowker, A.: Alfred the Great.

Bréhier, L.: Le Schisme Oriental.

Bubnov, N.: Gerberti postia Silvestri II Papæ, Opera Mathematica.

Bury, J. B.: History of the Eastern Roman Empire from the Fall of Irene to the Accession of Basil I.

Crivellucci, A.: Le Origini dello Stato della Chiesa.

Duchesne: Les Premiers Temps de l'État Pontifical.

Duchesne, L.: Autonomies Écclésiastiques.

Döllinger: Papst Fabeln des Mittelalters (Eng. trans.).

Freeman: Western Europe in the Eighth Century and Onward.

Gardner, A.: Studies in John the Scot; Theodore of Studium.

Gaskoin, C. J. B.: Alcuin.

Greinacher, A.: Die Anschauungen des Papstes Nikolaus I uber die Verhältniss von Staat u. Kirche.

Hatch, E.: Growth of Church Institutions.

Hergenröther, J.: Photius.

Hutton, W. H.: English Saints (Bampton Lectures, 1903).

Kampers, F.: Karl der Grosse.

Kovalevski: Ökonomische Entwickelung Europas.

Krumbacher, K.: Byzantinesche Literaturgeschichte.

Kurth, G.: Notger de Liège et la Civilization au Xiéme Siècle.

Kurth, G.: Saint Boniface.

Maitre, L.: Les Écoles Épiscopales et Monastiques.

Mullinger, J. B.: The Schools of Charles the Great and the Restoration of Education in the Ninth Century.

Plummer, C.: Life and Times of Alfred the Great.

Poupardin, M. R.: La Vie de Saint Didier.

Searle, W. G.: Anglo-Saxon Bishops, Kings and Nobles.

Simson, B.: Die Entstehung der Pseudoisidorischen Fälschungen.

Stevenson, W. H.: Asser's Life of King Alfred.

Taylor, H. O.: Classical Heritage of the Middle Ages.

Voght, A.: Basile I, Empereur de Byzance et la Civilisation Byzantine au fin du IX Siècle.

West, A. F.: Alcuin and the Rise of the Christian Schools.

Zoepf, L.: Das Heiligenleben im 10 Jahrhundert.

CHAPTER III

Boehmer, H.: Kirche und Staat in England und in der Normandie.

Chalandon, F.: Histoire de la Domination Normande en Italie et en Sicile.

Dmitrewski, von: Die Christliche Freiwillige Armut vom Ursprung der Kirche bis zum 12 Jahrhundert.

Döllinger: Das Papstthum.

Drehmann, S.: Papst Leo IX u. die Simonie (Goetz Beitrage).

Drehmann: Papst Leo IX u. die Simonie.

Dresdner, A.: Kultur u. Sittengeschichte der Italienischen Geistlichkeit im 10 u. 11 Jahrhundert.

Duff, Nora: Matilda of Tuscany.

Eberhard, A.: Das Mittelalter u. seine Kirchliche Entwickelung.

Fisher, H. A. L.: The Mediæval Empire.

Ghellinck, J. de: Le Mouvement Théologique du XII Siècle.

Gierke, O.: Das Deutsche Genossenschaft Recht.

Hampe, K.: Deutscher Kaisergeschichte im Zeitalter der Salien u. Staufer.

Hegel, C.: Geschichte d Stadteverfassung von Italien.

Hüffer, G.: Der Heilige Bernard von Clairvaux.

Krehbiel, E. B.: The Interdict, Its History and Operation.

Kugler: Geschichte d Kreuzzüge.

Lane-Poole, Stanley: Life of Saladin.

Liebermann, F.: Anselm von Canterbury u. Hugo von Lyon.

Luchaire, A.: Histoire des Institutions Monarchiques de la France.

Maitland, F. W.: Constitutional History of England.

Mann, H. K.: History of Mediæval Papacy.

Meyer, E.: Italienische Verfassungsgechichte.

Meyer von Knonau, G.: Jahrbucher des Deutschen Reichs unter Heinrich IV und Heinrich V.

Mirbt, C.: Publizistik im Zeitalter Gregors VII.

Palmarocchi: L'Abbazia di Montecassino e la Conquista Normanna.

Prutz: Kulturgeschichte der Kreuzzüge.

Reichel, O. J.: Rise of the Parochial System in England.

Reuter: Geschichte d Aufklärung im Mittelalter.

Schreiber, G.: Kurie u. Kloster im 12 Jahrhundert.

Simonsfeld, H.: Jahrbücher des Deutschen Reiches unter Freidrich I.

Stevenson, W. B.: The Crusaders in the East.

Stubbs, W.: Constitutional History of England; Introductions to the Rolls Series. (Complete only in original volumes.)

Stuts, U.: Eigekirchenvermögen; in Gierkefestschrift (pp. 1187-1268).

Vacandard, E.: Vie de Saint Bernard.

Vinogradoff: English Society in the Eleventh Century.

Voight, F. O.: Die Klosterpolitik der Salischen Kaiser und Könige.

Violet, P.: Histoire des Institutions Politiques and Administratives de la France.

Werminghoff: Verfassungsgeschichte der Deutschen Kirche im Mittelalter.

Workman, H. B.: Evolution of the Monastic Ideal.

CHAPTER IV

Allshorn: Life and Times of Frederick II.

Baier, H. L.: Päpstliche Provisionen fur niedere Pfrunden bis zum Jahr 1304.

Bateson, Mary: Mediæval England.

Berger, E.: St. Louis et Innocent IV.

Biehringer: Kaiser Friedrich II.

Bréhier, L.; L'Église et L'Orient au Moyen Age; Les Croisades.

Cartellieri, A.: Philip August.

Coulton: A Mediæval Garner.

Cuthbert: St. Francis of Assisi.

Denifle, H.: Die Universtäten des Mittelalters.

Dobiache Rojdesvendky Olga; La Vie Paroissiale en France au XIII Siècle.

Döllinger: Beiträge zur Sektengeschichte.

Dowden, J.: Mediæval Church in Scotland; The Bishops of Scotland.

Endres, J. A.: Thomas von Aquin.

Eubel, C.: Hierarchia Catholica Medii Ævi.

Folz, A.: Kaiser Friedrich II u. Papst Innozenz IV.

Frohschammer, S.: Die Philosophie des Thomas von Aquino.

Gebhart, E.: Italie Mystique.

Gierke, O.: Political Theories of the Middle Ages (trans. by Maitland, F. W.).

Goetz, W.: Die Quellen zur Geschichte des St. Franz von Assisi.

Göller, E.: Die Einnahmen der Apostolischen Kammer under Johann XXII; Der Liber Taxarum der Papstlichen Kammer.

Gordon: Innocent the Great.

Gütschow, E.: Innozenz III und England.

Hampe, K.: Kaiser Friedrich II.

Hauréau: Histoire de la Philosophie Scholastique.

Hefele: Die Bettelorden und das Religiöse Volksleben Ober und Mittel Italiens im 13 Jahrhundert.

Jörgensen, S.: St. Francis of Assisi.

Knox, W. F.: The Court of a Saint (Louis IX).

Lea, H. E.: A History of the Inquisition of the Middle Ages (in German translation with new material by Hansen, Jos.).

Ledger book of Vale Royal Abbey (Lancashire and Cheshire Record Society).

Luchaire, A.: Innocent III; La Société Française au temps de Phillippe Auguste.

Maitland, F. W.: Canon Law in the Church of England.

Michael, E.: Geschichte des Deutschen Volkes vom 13 Jahrhundert; Salimbene u. seine Chronik.

Mollat, G.: Les Popes d'Avignon 1305-1378.

Moore, E.: Studies in Dante.

Nitzch: Scholastische Theologie (Hauck-Herzog).

Pierson: Die Katholischen Armen.

Poole, R. L.: Illustrations of the History of Mediæval Thought.

Renan, E.: Averroes et L'Averroisme.

Rodocanachi, E.: Les Institutions Communales de Rome sous la Papauté.

Sabatier, P.: François d'Assise (Eng. trans.).

Salimbene, ed. by Holder-Egger (in Vol. XXXII *Monumenta Germanicæ Historicæ: Scriptores*).

Samaran, C., and Mollat, G.: La Fiscalité Pontificale en France au XIV Siècle.

Schneider, G.: Die Finanziellen Beziehungen der Florentinischen Bankiers zur Kirche von 1285 bis 1304.

Schnurer, G.: Franz von Assisi.

Sommerlad, Th.: Die Wirtschaftl Tätigkeit der Kirche in Deutschland.

Stevenson, F. S.: Life of Grosseteste.

Taylor, H. O.: The Mediæval Mind.

Tocco, F.: Studii Francescani; L'Eresia nel Medio Evo.

Vaughan, R. B.: St. Thomas of Aquin, His Life and Labours.

Villehardouin: Trans. by F. T. Marzials (Everyman's Library).

Werminghoff, A.: National Kirchliche Bestreburgen im Deutschen Mittelalter; Stutz Abhandlungen.

Woker, Ph.: Finanzwesen der Päpste.

CHAPTER V

Balthasar: Geschichte des Armutstreites im Franziskaner Orden bis zum Konzil von Vienne.

Bouillon, E.: La Politique Pontificale et le Retour du Saint Siège à Rome en 1376.

Boulting, W.: Æneas Silvius.

Browning, O.: Guelphs and Ghibellines.

Burckhardt: Kultur d Renaissance (Eng. trans.).

Cox, C.: The Sanctuaries and Sanctuary Seekers of Mediæval England.

Creighton, M.: History of the Papacy.

Eckstein, A.: Zur Finanzlage Felix V und des Basler Konzils.

Erler: Dietrich von Nieheim.

Finke: Papstum und Untergang des Templerordens.

Flavigny, de, C.: Sainte Brigitte de Suede.

Fueter, E.: Religion und Kirche in England im Funfzenrter Jahrhundert.

Gardner, E. G.: Saint Catherine of Siena.

Goldast: Monarchia Sancti Imperii.

Grabmann, A. L.: Die Geschschte der Scholastischen Methode.

Haller, J.: Papsttum und Kirchenreform.

Hansen, J.: Zauberwahn, Inquisition und Hexen Prozesse im Mittelalter.

Herzfeld, Marie: Das Zeitalter der Renaissance.

Holtzmann, R.: Wilhelm von Nogaret.

Howell, A. G. F.: S. Bernardino of Siena.

Imbart de la Tour: Les Origines de la Réforme.

Jorga: Geschichte d Osmanischen Reiches.

Kitts, E. J.: In the Days of the Councils: a Sketch of the Life and Times of Baldassare Cossa.

Koerting, G.: Petrarcas Leben und Werke.

Lang, A.: The Maid of France.

Lazaras: Das Basler Konzil.

Lucas, H.: Fra Girolamo Savonarola.

Lumsden, C. B.: The Dawn of Modern England.

Lutzow: Life and Times of Master John Huss.

Mackinnon, James: History of Modern Liberty.

Mathew: Pope Alexander VI.

Murray, T. D.: Jeanne d'Arc, Maid of Orleans.

Palacky: Geschichte Böhmens.

Pastor, L.: Geschichte der Päpste.

Richemont, de: Jeanne D'Arc d'apres les Documents Contemporains.

Schäfer, K. H.: Die Ausgaben der Apostolischen Kammer unter Johann XXII.

Schnitzer: Savonarola im Streite mit Seinem Orden und Sei-

nem Kloster; Quellen und Forschungen zur Geschichte Savonarolas.

Seeberg, R.: Die Theologie des J. Duns Scotus.

Schulte, A.: Die Fugger in Rom, 1495-1523.

Stutz, U.: Kirchenrechtliche Abhandlungen, Vols. 30, 31; also vols. 1 and 2 on Papal Finance.

Sulvès: Päpstliche Wahlkapitulationen u. Machtbestrebungen des Kardinalats.

Trevelyan, G. M.: England in the Age of Wycliffe.

Valois, N.: La Crise Religieuse des XV Siècle; La France et le Grand Schisme D'Occident; Le Pape et le Concile (cf. *Historiche Zeitschrift*, Vol. 110, p. 338).

Villari, P.: Storia di Savonarola (Eng. trans.).

Voight: Pius II u Sein Zeitalter; Weiderbelebung des Klasseschen Altertums.

Woodward, W. H.: Cesare Borgia.

Woolf, C. N. S.: Bartolus of Sassoferrato, His Position in the History of Mediæval Political Thought.

Workman, H. B.: The Dawn of the Reformation.

Wylie, J. H.: The Council of Constance.

CHAPTER VI

Acton, Lord: Lectures on Modern History; History of Freedom; Historical Essays and Studies.

Allen, P. S.: Age of Erasmus.

Armstrong, E.: The Emperor Charles V; French Wars of Religion, their Political Aspects.

Barge, H.: Andreas Bodenstein von Karlstadt.

Baumgarten, H.: Geschichte Karls V.

Bayne, C. G.: Anglo-Roman Relations, 1558-1565.

Birt: Elizabethan Religious Settlement.

Blennerhassett, Lady: Maria Stuart Konigen von Schottland (French trans.).

Boehmer, H.: Luther im Lichte der Neueren Forschung.

Boehmer-Romundt, H.: Die Jesuiten.

Bossert, A.: Jean Calvin.

Bratli, C.: Filip II af Spanien (French trans.).

Brieger: Die Reformation.

Briggs, C. A.: Theological Symbolics.

Brosch, W.: Englische Geschichte.

Brown, Hume: John Knox.

Brown, P. H.: History of Scotland.

Burrage, C.: The Early English Dissenters in the Light of Recent Research.

Carrière, M.: Philosophische Welt Auschaung der Reformationszeit.

Cheyney, E. P.: A History of England from the Defeat of the Armada to the Death of Elizabeth.

Child, G. W.: Church and State under the Tudors.

Cornelius, C. A.: Historische Arbeiten.

Creighton, M.: Queen Elizabeth.

Denifle, H.: Luther und Luthertum.

Dixon, R. W.: Church History of England.

Doumergue, E.: Jean Calvin.

Ellinger, G.: Melancthon.

Erasmus: Selected Letters (Nichols, F. M.).

Erasmi Epistolæ (ed. P. S. Allen).

Filon: Marie Stuart.

Frere and McC. Kennedy: Visitation Articles and Injunctions of the Period of the Reformation.

Gairdner: History of Lollardy and the Reformation.

Gasquet: Henry VIII and the Monasteries.

Gee, H.: The Elizabethan Clergy and the Settlement of Religion

Gothein, E.: Ignatius von Loyola und die Gegenreformation.

Grisar, H.: Luther (cf. *Theologische Rundschau*, 1913, pp. 276 seq., Eng. trans.).

Hailie, M.: Reginald Pole.

Hauser, H.: Études sur la Réforme Française.

Heidrich, E.: Dürer und die Reformation.

Heroes of the Reformation Series (Putnam's).

Hübner, von: Sixte Quint (Eng. trans.).

Hume, M. A. S.: Treason and Plot; Philip II; Spain, Its Greatness and Decay.

Janssen, J.: Geschichte des Deutschen Volks (Eng. trans., abridged).

Kampschulte, F. W.: Johann Calvin, seine Kirche u sein Staat in Genf.

Kidd, B. J.: Documents illustrative of the Continental Reformation.

Köhler, W.: Grisars Luther in Deutsche Literaturzeitung, June 21-28, 1913.

Lang, A.: History of Scotland.

Lea: History of the Spanish Inquisition.

Lenz, M.: Leben Luthers; Kleine Historische Schriften.

Lindeboom, J.: Erasmus, Erasmus Onderzoek naar zijne Theolcgie.

Lindsay: History of the Reformation.

Lupton, J. H.: Life of John Colet.

McGiffert, A. C.: Life of Luther.

Makower, S.: Die Verfassung der Kirche von England (Eng. trans.).

Martin, G.: Gustave Vasa et la Réforme en Suede.

Mathieson, W. L.: Politics and Religion in Scotland, 1550-1695.

Merkle, S.: Studien zur Geschichte des Konzils von Trient (*Hist. Jahrbuch.*, Vol. 31, 2 seq.).

Meyer, A.: Étude Critique sur les Relations d'Érasme et de Luther.

Meyer, A. O.: England und die Katholische Kirche unter Elizabeth und den Stuarts.

Müller, Karl: Kirche, Gemeinde und Obrigkeit.

Mumby, F. A.: Elizabeth and Mary Stuart.

Nisard, D.: Renaissance et Réforme.

Paulus, N.: Protestantismus und Toleranz.

Philipps, G. E.: The Extinction of the Ancient Hierarchy.

Pollard, A. F. P.: Political History of England; England under Protector Somerset; Henry VIII.

Prothero, G. W.: Select Statutes, and other documents bearing on the Reigns of Elizabeth and James I.

Ranke: Französische Geschichte; Englische Geschichte (Eng. trans.).

Reusch, F. H.: Der Index der Verbotenen Bücher.

Reyburn, H. J.: John Calvin.

Ritschl: Geschichte des Pietismus.

Rodocanachi, E.: Rome au temps de Jules II et de Leon X.

Rose-Troup, F.: The Western Rebellion of 1549.

Savine, A.: English Monasteries on the Eve of the Dissolution.

Seebohm, Fr.: The Oxford Reformers.

Smith, P.: Life and Letters of Martin Luther; Luther's Correspondence.

Stähelin, R.: Huldreich Zwingli sein Leben u. Wirken.

Susta, J.: Die Römische Curie und das Konzil von Trient unter Pius IV.

Taunton, E. L.: Thomas Wolsey; History of the Jesuits in England.

Trésal, J.: Les Origines du Schisme Anglican.

Usher, R. G.: Reconstruction of the English Church.

Vedder, H. C.: The Reformation in Germany.

Ware, S. L.: The Elizabethan Parish in Its Ecclesiastical and Financial Aspects.

Wernle, P.: Renaissance und Reformation.

Zucker, Markus: Albrecht Dürer in Seinen Briefen.

CHAPTER VII

Addison, D. D.: The Clergy in American Life and Letters.

Acton, Lord: Lectures on the French Revolution.

Adeney, W. F.: The Greek and Eastern Churches.

Allen and McClure: History of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.

American Church History Series (N. Y.).

Balleine: History of the Evangelical Party.

Benson, A. C.: Life of Archbishop Benson.

Bradford, Wm.: History of Plimouth Plantation.

Birkbeck: Russia and England during the last Fifty Years.

Bremond: Les Ames Religieuses; Newman.

Church: Life and Letters of Dean Church.

Cobham, C. D.: The Patriarchs of Constantinople.

Cross, A. L.: The Anglican Episcopate and the American Colonies.

Döllinger: Der Papst und das Konzil (ed. by J. Friedrich).

Debidour, A.: L'Eglise Catholique et l'État sous la Troisieme Republique.

Dennis, J. S.: Christian Missions and Social Progress.

Dezert, du, G. D.: L'Église et l'État en France depuis l'Édit de Nantes Jusqu' à nos Jours.

Dowden, E.: Puritan and Anglican.

Figgis, J. N.: Divine Right of Kings.

Firth: Oliver Cromwell.

Fortescue, A.: The Orthodox Eastern Churches; The Lesser Eastern Churches.

Fouqueroy, H.: Histoire de la Compagnie de Jésus en France des Origines à la Suppression.

Franz, H.: Studien zur Kirchlichen Reform Josephs II, etc.

Goyau, G.: L'Allemagne Religieuse.

Goetz, L. K.: Staat und Kirche in Altrussland.

Granderath u Kirsch: Geschichte des Vatikanischen Konzils.

Hausrath, A.: Richard Rothe und Seine Freunde.

Heimbucher: Die Orden u. Kongregationen der Katholischen Kirche.

Kissling, J. B.: Geschichte des Kultur Kampfes im Deutschen Reiches.

Lathbury: Correspondence of W. E. Gladstone on Church and Religion.

Launay: Histoire Génèrale de la Société des Missions Étrangères.

Leger, A.: L'Angleterre Religieuses et les Origines du Methodisme; Le Jeunnesse de Wesley.

Loth, J., and Verger: Mémoires de l'Abbé Baston.

Lovett, R.: History of the London Missionary Society.

Mathiez, A.: Rome et le Clergé Français sous la Constituante.

Mirbt, C.: Geschichte der Katholischen Kirche von der Mitte des 18 Jahrhundert bis zum Vatikanischen Konzil.

Nielsen: History of the Papacy in the XIX Century.

Nippold, F.: Handbuch d Neuesten Kirchengeschichte.

Overton and Relton: The English Church from the Accession of George I to the end of the XVIII Century.

Paseve, C. F.: Two Hundred Years of the S. P. G.

Pierling: La Russie et le Saint Siége.

Pisani: L'Église de Paris et la Révolution.

Plessis, de, J.: History of Christian Missions in South Africa.

Purcell: Life of Cardinal Manning.

St. Cyres, Lord: Fénelon; Pascal.

Shaw, W. A.: History of the English Church during the Civil War and the Commonwealth.

Smirnoff, E.: Russian Orthodox Missions.

Smith, Russell: Religious Liberty under Charles II and James II.

Speer: Missions and Modern History.

Stephen, Sir James: Essays in Ecclesiastical Biography.

Stock, Eugene: History of the Church Missionary Society.

Theiner: Geschichte d Pontifikats Klemens XIV.

Thureau-Dangin, P.: La Renaissance Catholique en Angleterre au XIX Siècle.

Usher, R. G.: Rise and Fall of the High Commission.

Vigener, F.: Gallikanismus und Episkopalistische Strömungen im Vaticanum und Deutschen Katholizismus Zwischen Tridentinum (*Hist. Zeit.*, Vol. 3, p. 495).

Ward, W.: Life of Cardinal Newman.

Warneck, S.: The Living Forces of the Gospel; History of Protestant Missions.

Weber, E.: Die Philosophische Scholastik des Deutschen Protestantismus im Zeitalter der Orthodoxie.

Wilberforce: Life of Bishop Wilberforce.

Winchester, C. T.: John Wesley.

Workman, H. B.: A New History of Methodism.

INDEX

A

Abelard, 101, 102.
Abyssinia, 7.
Adalbert, Archbishop, 89, 90
Adoptionism, 47.
Advertisements, 245.
Acacius, 4.
Agnellus, 20.
Agobard, 60.
Albert the Great, 148.
Albornoz, 170.
Alcuin, 47.
Alfred the Great, 58.
Alexander II, 77, 78.
Alexander III, 116, 119, 132
Alexander IV, 11, 160.
Amalric of Bennes, 150.
American Christianity, 229–310.
American Colonies, 290, 291, 292, 300.
Anabaptists, 259.
Andrewes, Bishop, 265.
Anne, Queen, 270.
Anselm, 84, 95, 100, 101.
Anskar, 49, 89.
Anti-clericalism, 283, 284, 285
Anton, 295.
Apostolic Succession, Doctrine of, 264.
Aquileia, 2.
Aquinas, 148.
Arians, 9, 10, 21.
Arles, 3.
Armenia, 7.
Arnold, Dr., 373, 276.
Arnold of Brescia, 113, 114.
Arnulf of Rheims, 65, 66.
Aristotle, 147, 148.
Articles, the Ten, 231, 232.
Articles, the Six, 232, 234.
Articles, the Forty-two, 236.
Articles, the Thirty-nine, 241.
Augsburg Confession, 213.
Augsburg, Peace of, 215.
Augustine, 14.
Augustinians, 142.
Avignon, 163, 169, 170, 171.

B

Baptists, 302.
Bardanes, Jacob, 6.
Barneveldt, 292.
Bartholomew, St., 250.
Basel, Council of, 178, 179.
Beaton, 248.
Beatrice of Tuscany, 74.
Becket, Thomas à, 118, 119.
Bede, 30.
Beghines, 145, 246.
Benedict (of Agnani), 49.
Benedict (of Nursia), 27, 28.
Benedict IX, 69.
Benedict XIII, 172.
Benedictines, 18.
Benson, Abp., 277.
Berengar, 94, 95.
Bernard, St., 96, 97, 102, 112, 114, 120, 123.
Bernardino of Siena, 183.
Boëthius, 100.
Böhme, Jacob, 261.
Bolsec, 223.
Bonaventura, 148.
Boniface, St., 40, 41, 42.
Boniface VIII, 162. 164, 165.
Bossuet, 279.
Bouvines, 128.
Brandenburg, 289.
Bridget, St., 170.
Browne, 246.
Brunhilde, 13.
Bucer, 234.
Bulgarians, 54, 55.

C

Cajetan, 203, 258.
Calvin, 219, 223, 250.

Calvinism, 224, 225, 289, 292, 309.
Cambridge, 147.
Canon Law, 109, 157.
Canossa, 81.
Canute, 89.
Capet, Hugh, 65.
Capuchins, 296.
Carmelites, 142.
Cashel, Synod of, 121.
Cassiodorus, 29.
Catherine of Siena, 171.
Celularius, Michael, 91.
Chapters, Three, 5, 6, 18.
Charles of Anjou, 153.
Charles II, 268.
Charles V, 195, 208, 210, 213, 214, 216, 254.
Charles Martel, 31, 39, 41, 42.
Charles the Great, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48.
Christian III, 252.
Church Missionary Society, 298.
Chrodegang, Bishop, 42.
Cistercians, 97, 98, 99, 112, 121, 122.
Citeaux, 97.
Civil Constitution of the Clergy, 281.
Clairvaux, 97.
Clement V, 163, 164.
Clement VI, 171.
Clement VII, 212, 253.
Clovis, 10.
Cluny, 62.
Colet, 227.
Columbanus of Luxeuil and Bobbio, 10, 27, 28.
Columba, 9.
Conceptualism, 101.
Concordat, 282.
Confession, 25, 144, 145.
Confraternities, 104, 105.
Congregationalism, 267, 268, 307.
Conrad, 153.
Constance, Council of, 173-74
Constans II, 35.
Constantinian Donation, 44, 45, 76, 120, 189.
Constantinople, 130.
Cortenuova, 152.
Cranmer, Abp., 232, 233, 236, 238.
Crescentii, 66.
Cromwell, Thomas, 229, 231. 235.
Crusades, 78, 92, 93, 94, 122, 123, 124, 130, 131, 155.
Culdees, 59.
Curia, 110, 111, 112.
Curial System, 137, 139.
Cyril, 54.

D

D'Ailly, Peter, 172.
Damiani, 69, 77.
Deutz, Ruprecht von, 102.
Dionysius (pseudo-), 7, 8, 60, 148.
Disestablishment, 278, 283.
Dissenters, 268, 269.
Divorce (Queen Catherine), 228.
Dolcino, 193, 194.
Dominic, St., 141.
Dominicans, 142, 145, 147.
Duns Scotus, 186, 187
Dunstan, 65.

E

Eastern Church, 90, 91, 92, 123, 310, 316.
Eck, 202, 204, 207.
Ecthesis, 35.
Ecumenical Council (Fifth), 6; (Sixth), 36; (Seventh), 39.
Edessa, 123.
Edward VI, 234, 237.
Edwards, Jonathan, 302.
Elizabeth, Queen, 239, 242, 243, 244, 245.
Erasmus, 197, 198, 199.
Erigena, 147, 150.
Eugenius II, 112, 114.
Eugenius IV, 179.

Evangelical Alliance, 295.
Evangelical Party, 272.
Expectancies, 138.

F

Farel, 221.
Febronius, 280.
Felix, 4.
Fénelon, 279.
Ferrer, Vincent, 183.
Feudalism, 51.
Filioque, 47, 48.
Finance, papal, 82, 111.
Fiore, Joachim di, 149, 150, 159, 160.
Florence, Act of Union with East, 178, 179.
Formosus, 57.
Francis of Asissi, 140, 141, 142, 143, 145.
Franciscans, 142, 145, 147, 159, 169.
Franks, 295.
Frederick I, 114, 115, 119, 128.
Frederick II, 127, 151, 152, 155.
French Republic, 283.
French Revolution, 281.
Fulbert of Chartres, 94.

G

Gallican Articles, 279, 282, 287.
Gandersheim, 66.
Gardiner, Bishop, 232.
Gebhard, Bishop (Victor II), 72.
Geneva, Reformation at, 221, 224.
Georgian Period, 270, 272.
Gerbert, 66.
Gerson, 172.
Gladstone, 266.
Gottschalk, 60.
Gratian, 109.
Gregory I, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 28, 29.
Gregory II, 38, 40.
Gregory VI, 69.
Gregory VII (Hildebrand), 70, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 87, 95.
Gregory IX, 147, 157, 159.
Gregory XI, 170.
Groot, Gerhard, 184.
Grosstete, Robert, 158.
Grotius, 292.
Guiscard, Robert, 73, 93.
Gustavus Adolphus Society, 295.

H

Hadrian I, 44.
Hadrian II, 115.
Hadrian VI, 210, 253.
Hamburg, 49, 88, 89.
Hatfield, Synod of, 18.
Henry II, 67.
Henry III, 69, 70, 71, 73, 74.
Henry IV, 79, 80.
Henry V, 85.
Henry VI, 125, 126.
Henry I (of England), 84, 85.
Henry II, 118, 119, 120, 121.
Henry VIII, 228–233.
Henry IV (of France), 251.
Heraclius, 35.
Heresy, Punishment, 107, 108.
Hincmar, 51, 53, 59.
Hobart, Bishop, 303.
Honorius, 36.
Hooper, 236.
Hospitalers, 122.
Hrabanus Maurus, 59.
Huguenots, 251.
Humanism, 188, 189, 292.
Humbert, Cardinal, 75, 91.
Humiliati, 132, 133.
Hungarians, 88.
Huss, 177.
Husssites, 192, 204.
Hutten, 205, 211.

I

Iconoclasm, 38, 39, 47, 48.
Ignatius, 54, 55,
Illyricum, 13.

Indulgences, 104, 144, 200, 201, 202, 255.
Infallibility, 287.
Innocent III, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 135, 137, 138, 139, 140.
Innocent IV, 143, 144, 152, 156.
Inquisition, 154, 181.
Interdict, 68, 80, 83.
Interim, 215.
Investiture, 75, 79, 84, 85, 86, 87.
Iona, 17.
Irene, Empress, 39.
Irish Church, 9, 15, 16, 17, 19.
Isidore (of Seville), 29.
Islam, 31, 32, 33, 34.

J

James I, 265.
James II, 268.
Jansen, 279.
Jerusalem, 93, 124.
Jesuits, 257, 258, 280, 296, 297.
Jews, 34.
Joan of Arc, 184.
John I, 41.
John VIII, 55.
John XII, 64.
John XXII, 169.
John XXIII, 173.
John (of England), 128.
John the Scot, 60.
Joseph II, 280.
Julius II, 194.
Julius III, 254.
Justinian I, 1, 5, 7, 10, 11, 23.
Justinian II, 37.

K

Karlstadt, 210.
Kathari, 106, 107, 108.
Katharists, 134, 135, 155, 193.
Keble, 274.
Kempen, Thomas von, 185.
Kiev, 90.
King, Bishop, 277.
Knox, John, 248.
Kulturkampf, 284.

L

Landau, Johann of, 167.
Land System (Germanic), 22, 23.
Lanfranc, 84, 94, 95.
Langton, Stephen, 128, 129.
Las Casas, 296.
Lateran Council, 131, 145, 194.
Laud, 265.
Legates, papal, 77.
Legnano, 116.
Leo I, 3.
Leo III, 47.
Leo VIII, 64.
Leo IX, 70, 71, 72, 73, 91.
Leo X, 194, 195, 200, 207.
Leo of Achrida, 91.
Leo the Isaurian, 38.
Leyden, 292.
Leonine City, 57.
Liutprand, 20, 38.
Lollards, 176, 177.
Lombard, Peter, 102.
Lombards, 12, 13, 28, 36, 37, 38, 44.
London Missisnary Society, 298.
Loubet, President, 283.
Louis the Bavarian, 169.
Louis the Pius, 50.
Louis IX (Saint) 154, 158.
Lothair, 11, 52.
Loyola, Ignatius, 251.
Luther, 199–214, 218, 247, 260.
Lutheranism, 252, 253, 292, 295.

M

Magna Charta, 128, 129.
Magyars, 56.
Malachi, 120.
Malleus Maleficorum, 186.
Manfred, 153.
Marburg, 218.

Marionites, 36.
Marprelate Controversy, 246.
Marriage, Clerical, 58, 59, 67, 68.
Marsilius of Padua, 167.
Martin I, 36.
Martin V, 174.
Martyr, Peter, 234.
Mary de Guise, 248.
Mary, Queen, 237, 239.
Mary, Queen of Scotland, 242, 249.
Maurice, 14, 276.
Melancthon, 213.
Mendicants, 152.
Methodists, 302, 306, 307.
Methodius, 53.
Michael III, 53, 54.
Milan, 2, 3, 12.
Missions, 33, 40, 45, 46, 49, 88, 89, 90, 91, 122, 123, 156, 157, 191, 296, 299.
Modernism, 287, 288.
Mohammed, 30.
Monasteries, Dissolution of English, 231.
Monophysites, 5, 6, 7, 8, 33, 35, 36.
Monothelitism, 36, 37.
Montfort, Simon of, 135.
Moravia, 54, 55.
Moravians, 193.
More, Thomas, 227, 230.
Mozarabic Liturgy, 78.
Münster, 261.
Mystics, 149.

N

Nantes, Edict of, 251.
Navas de Tolosa, 130.
Neri Philip, 258.
Nestorian Church, 156.
Nestorians, 32, 33.
Newman, 274.
Nicholas I, 50, 52, 53, 54.
Nicholas II, 73, 76.
Nicholas V, 179, 180.
Nilus, 64.
Non-Jurors, 269.
Nominalism, 100.
Norbert of Xanten, 104.
Normans, 72, 73, 86.
Northmen, 56, 58.
Northumberland, 236.

O

Occam, William of, 187, 188.
Odilo, 67.
Olaf (of Norway), 89.
Oratorians, 258.
Organic Laws, 282.
Origen, 5, 7.
Oswald, 15.
Otto the Great, 63, 64.
Otto III, 65, 66.
Oxford, 147.
Oxford Movement, 273, 276.

P

Pallium, 4, 12.
Papal Elections, 76.
Paris, 146, 147.
Parish, 24, 25.
Parker, 241.
Parma, John of, 159.
Patrick, 8.
Paul III, 254.
Paul IV, 239.
Peasant Revolt, 211.
Pelagius, 6.
Pelagius II, 28.
Penda, 15.
Penitential System, 25, 26, 27, 103.
Peter's Pence, 111.
Petrarch, 170, 189, 190.
Philip II of France, 129.
Philip le Bel, 162, 165, 166.
Philip II of Spain, 215, 237, 239, 242, 243.
Phokas, 14.
Photius, 54, 55.
Pippin, 43.
Pisa, Council of, 172.
Pius IV, 255.
Pius V, 242.

Poland, 289.
Pole, Cardinal, 137, 239, 241.
Polo, Marco, 156.
Pornocracy, 57, 58.
Porrée, Gilbert de la, 102.
Port Royal, 279.
Postulations, 138.
Præmonstratensians, 89, 121.
Pragmatic Sanction, 181.
Prayer Book, 235, 236, 240.
Prayer Book Revision, 301, 304.
Presbyterians, 267, 268, 290.
Propaganda Fide, De, 296.
Protestant, 212.
Protestant Episcopal, 301.
Provisions, 138.
Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals, 52, 53, 63, 83, 190.
Puritanism, 265, 266, 267.
Puritans, 244, 245, 246, 265.
Pusey, 274.

R

Radbert, 59.
Ranke, 266.
Ratramn, 59.
Ravenna. 2, 37, 38, 44.
Raymond, Count of Toulouse, 135.
Realism, 101.
Reccared, 9, 12.
Reformed Episcopal Church, 304.
Regalian rights, 63, 117.
Religious Orders, 288.
Renaissance Papacy, 180.
Reservations, 110, 111.
Restoration, 267.
Rheims Synod, 71.
Ridley, 236, 238.
Ritualism, 276, 277.
Romuald, 64, 69.
Roscellin (of Compiègne), 100.
Rothad of Soissons, 53.
Rubric, Ornaments, 240.
Russian Church, 191, 312-316.

S

St. Maur, Abby of, 279.
Sancho, 67.
Saracens, 56, 57.
Savonarola, 183, 184.
Savoy Conference, 267.
Schism, the Great, 170–172.
Scholasticism, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103.
Seabury, 301.
Servetus, 223.
Sigismund, Emperor, 173.
Simons, Menno, 261.
Simony, 67, 68, 75.
Siricius, 2.
Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, 298, 300.
Somerset, 236.
Spener, 295.
Speyer, Diet of, 212.
Spoliation Right, 63.
Stephen, 43.
Strassburg, Reformation at, 220.
Swiss Reformation, 217, 226.
Symmachus, 3.

T

Taborites, 192.
Taxation (papal), 158, 161, 168.
Templars, 122, 164, 165.
Temporal Power, 43, 86, 286.
Tetzel, 199, 202.
Teutonic Knights, 157.
Theodelinda, 13.
Theodore, Abp., 18, 25, 30.
Theodoric the Ostrogoth, 4.
Toleration Act, 269.
Tract XC, 274.
Trent, 254, 255, 256, 257.
Truce of God, 68.
Turner, C. H., 1.
Typus, 35.

U

Ultramontanism, 287.
Unam Sanctum, 162.

Uniformity Act, 240, 268.
Universities, 149, 148.
Urban VI, 171.
Utraquists, 192.

V

Valla, Laurentius, 189, 205.
Vallombrosa, 69.
Vasa, Gustavus, 252.
Vatican Council (1870), 287.
Victor, St., School of, 102, 103.
Vienne, Council of, 165.
Vigilius, 6, 11.
Visigoths, 34.

W

Walbert, 69.
Waldensians, 132, 133, 134, 155, 193.
Ward, Wilfrid, 257.
Wesley, John, 271, 272.
White, Bishop, 301.
Whitgift, 245.
Wido, 77.
Wilfrid, 17.
William of Dijon, 91.
William of Normandy, 78, 84.
William III, 270.
Willibrord, 40.
Wishart, 248.
Witchcraft, 185, 186.
Wladimir, 90,
Wolsey, 229.
Worms, Concordat of, 85, 86, 115.
Worms, Diet of, 209.
Wyclif, 175, 176.

X

Xavier, 296.

Z

Zacharias, 43.
Zosimus, 3.
Zwingli, 216, 217, 218, 219, 260.

DATE DUE

GAYLORD

PRINTED IN U.S.A

124508 270 R B467 C3

Bevan, W.L.
Church History.

270.R
B467
C3

124508